Don't Make a Problem of Anything

DISCUSSIONS WITH J KRISHNAMURTI

Sources
Foreword: Archival Typescripts of Dictations
Discussions: Archival Transcripts made from Audiotapes

Don't Make a Problem of Anything: Discussions with J Krishnamurti
Copyright © 2007 Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd

Don’t Make a Problem of Anything

DISCUSSIONS WITH
J KRISHNAMURTI

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

Contents

Introduction

Foreword

1. **A Nucleus of People Committed to the Teachings**
   Is there a group of people soaked in the teachings?—Commitment not to the person of K—Forming a nucleus of people who are not disciples, but who will study the teachings—Not a closed or secret body—What is the intellectual, aesthetic quality of such a group?—Having a feeling of responsibility to the teachings and to humanity—The teaching covers the whole of human life—What is your relationship to the world?—It is a wrong question because you are the world.

2. **Is Our Relationship Based on Function?**
   Taking the initiative to form a nucleus—On trust—Are we of the same mind, the same intention?—You are both the teachers and disciples of the teachings—No status, only function—Is our relationship based on function?—If it is based on an activity, an ideal, it has no meaning—How do you convey all this to the student?—I want to help the student, through mathematics, to come to have such intelligence—Attention, love, compassion, and intelligence go together—On disagreement and learning.

3. **On Being Totally Free of Ideals**
   This place is not only a school but a centre of a religious people—What is a religious mind?—It has no belief, no ideal, no concept towards which it is working—No sense of becoming something, of having a future—Need for a group of people who are totally free of ideals—Putting aside the concept of non-violence—How will you study the violence in you?—Being free of ideals and beliefs—Your immovable state and what it does to the students.

4. **The Cessation of Conflict**
   Find out if one can lead a life without a single conflict—Questioning the divisive process of agreement and disagreement—For a religious group to be, there must be no conflict—Images give a sense of identity, a sense of stability, a sense of isolation—I live on something dead and therefore my brain also dies—Seeing the divisive nature of images, which brings conflict—On love—Building together a religious centre—Cooperation not around a person, an ideal, but the spirit of cooperation.

5. **Are We Human Beings or Professionals?**
   Are we teachers first or human beings first?—As human beings, are we flowering?—The human being is more important than the profession—Both

teachers and students are a bundle of instincts, emotions, contradictions—There is the feeling that we must bring about good human beings—Why have I made it a problem?—I approach this problem as a professional—Mind is trained to look at life from a professional viewpoint—Inwardly I am not going to make anything into a problem.

6. **Don't Make a Problem of Anything in Life**
   Are we aware that we are trained to solve problems?—Moving away from this tendency—Are you approaching a human problem as a professional?—Envy and the machinery that makes it a problem—Stopping the machinery which creates the problem—It can stop only when you realize that it is a problem-solving machinery—The machinery is the real trouble, not the fact—The feeling of not making anything in life into a problem—When the machinery ends, the mind undergoes a tremendous change.

7. **Psychological Evolution is an Illusion**
   What is a religious mind?—The place of belief in religious life—Why do you believe in a future life, in principles, in ideals?—You never achieve the good by allowing time—A religious mind has no feeling of reward and punishment—Has a religious mind a future?—There is no such thing as evolution apart from the biological—The religious mind has no evolution—The good has no relationship to the bad—Helping the student to listen—In attention, watching is most important.

8. **On Being a Guest of the World**
   The creative movement—The religious mind is the most creative mind—A mind that has never been hurt and has the quality of pristine originality—Helping to free the students and teachers from hurt—On examinations and fear—In a place where there is no fear, what happens to the student?—The feeling of being at home—The difference between being a guest and being at home—The true meaning of Vedanta as the end of knowledge—On there being no duality and no evolution.

List of Participants

Introduction

In 1929 when Krishnamurti dissolved the Order of the Star in the East, symbolizing his breakaway from all spiritual organizations and belief systems, he spelt out clearly his one-point mission: ‘to set men absolutely, unconditionally free’. It was a mission that seemed to fulfil itself wherever he was and wherever he went, its intensity remaining undiminished by time and circumstance and, in fact, gathering new energy and momentum as his age advanced. He stated and restated his vision in different contexts and in different words—that he, the teacher, was not important, that the institutions he founded were not important, and that even his material legacy to the world—his books and tapes—was not important. Living the teachings, and not living on the words of his teachings, was perhaps the only thing that he expected of those who flocked to his talks, read his books, or joined his institutions.

When Krishnamurti came to India in the winter of 1982, he set for himself a hectic schedule of talks and discussions. After a series of four public talks in Calcutta, he went to Rishi Valley School, the first school he founded, and later to Vasanta Vihar, which was his home and the venue of his public talks in Madras and which he wanted to become a study centre for serious seekers. In these two places, he called meetings of his close associates, the staff of his schools, and others interested in his teachings, and held what came to be called the ‘Nucleus Group Discussions’.

At the very outset of these discussions, Krishnamurti takes care to emphasize that the nucleus group he envisages is not a closed body or a secret body and that, on the contrary, the door is open to anyone who has ‘a feeling of responsibility to the teachings and to humanity’. Stating unequivocally what this responsibility means, he asks: ‘Is there a group of people who are completely involved in this, not in the school, not in being acquainted with a particular subject, but in this thing? ... Could we form such a group who will carry on, not as disciples of K, or as disciples of an idea or a theory, a concept, and so on, but actually study the teachings, live it, flower in it, be passionate about it?’ It was always *the* teachings and never *my* teachings.

Special mention must be made of the first two discussions in Madras, which represent a classic confrontation between the conditioned mind that looks at life as one huge problem to be solved and the unconditioned mind that flows freely with the currents of life. In these two long discussions Krishnamurti goes deeply into the question of problems, drawing, in the process, a most interesting distinction between the ‘professional’ and the ‘human being’. He asks whether we do not regard ourselves as professionals first and as human beings afterwards. Our education, he points out, generally makes us professionals in the sense that right from childhood we are trained to solve physical and intellectual problems. The brain thus gets conditioned to solving problems, and it carries over the same mentality to the psychological realm, the realm of relationships and emotions, and so comes to look upon any human situation, any thought, any emotion, any feeling as a terrible problem to be solved. The very nature of the problem-solving

mind is its inability to see itself as the problem-creating mind, and so it never comes to the end of problems. In different contexts, through various examples, Krishnamurti returns again and again to the need for freedom from this problem-solving mind and strikes a most passionate note when he sums up his insight: ‘All that we are saying is: *Don’t make a problem of anything in life*. I wonder if you have got this in your blood?’

Though in all these discussions Krishnamurti is addressing mostly teachers, there is something here for everyone: for those interested in a new kind of education, for parents, for the pundits in Vedanta or Buddhism, for psychologists, for those in the ordinary workaday world, for religious seekers...

K K

Foreword

Two statements by Krishnamurti[1]

In a world that is rapidly deteriorating into many forms of destruction, one feels it is necessary in this darkness to have places like Rajghat, Rishi Valley, Bangalore, and Madras, where there are a few people who are totally free from all national, political, and religious organizations with their absurdities. These groups are totally dedicated to being the centres of a new way of living. They are not concerned with their own personal salvation, but as they are the rest of humanity, they have to become both teachers and disciples of the teachings. They have to learn, understand, not intellectually but at great depth, what the teachings imply in daily life, be thoroughly soaked in it, and also become teachers of it.

This implies great responsibility. Where there is responsibility, there is no sense of egotistic fulfilment or expression, for that very responsibility wipes away self-centred activities. Responsibility implies cooperation, not for a cause or a person or an ideal, but the spirit of cooperation, and this is specially, urgently needed in this country. When one knows how to cooperate in the deepest sense of the word, one will also know when not to cooperate.

There are only a few of them in these schools, and they may not want to take part in the daily activities of the schools, but if they wish to, they naturally can. This nucleus is composed essentially of those who have not the spirit of hierarchical submission. As they flower in the teachings, they might live, dwell on the campus or on a piece of land belonging to the Foundation. They might become writers, they might go out and talk about their understanding of their life and the teachings, or they may do nothing.

In essence, these groups understand the nature of freedom, which is a very complex affair. Freedom is not what one wants to do or desires to do, but they being actually the whole of mankind, their own particular, limited comprehension of what is freedom has no place. Freedom means responsibility, and a free man lives in complete order, not only outwardly but first inwardly. It is not a monastic group taking vows and all that kind of thing, but they have come together voluntarily because to them these teachings are all-important. If they understand all this, these places will be the centres of light in a world of darkness. This is not a mere rhetorical phrase; this is the function of these groups who are a light to themselves and so a light to mankind.

Because there are no rules or regulations or dictums for any obedience or surrender or acceptance, they are free human beings coming together for these teachings and flowering in the teachings.

Flowering implies not the repetition of words of what K has said, but living the very teachings themselves, because you have investigated it, explored the depth and the truth of it. So it is yours and not somebody else's. You must bear in mind that this group is not necessarily a celibate group: they might marry, have

[1] These statements were dictated by Krishnamurti to one of his associates, Mrs Sunanda Patwardhan.

children, and those very children will be the future human beings as the parents must be.

This is not a closed body, nor is it some kind of elite group. The door is open for anybody who, wherever he may be, may bring about such a nucleus in different parts of this country. To really bring about a nucleus, there must be deep, unquestionable honesty, integrity, and humility not to be measured and weighed by another.

Rishi Valley, 5 December 1982

This group must be thoroughly soaked in the teachings, intellectually and otherwise. They are the disciples and the teachers of the teachings, not of K.

As they are the teachers and disciples of the teachings, they must be able to answer questions, without referring to me at all. That is why they are the teachers and disciples.

As you are both, the disciple and the teacher, you don't become an authority; you are teaching and learning all the time, and there is no vanity.

Calcutta, 24 November 1982

Discussions in Rishi Valley

1

A Nucleus of People Committed to the Teachings

Is there a group of people soaked in the teachings?—Commitment not to the person of K—Forming a nucleus of people who are not disciples, but who will study the teachings—Not a closed or secret body—What is the intellectual, aesthetic quality of such a group?—Having a feeling of responsibility to the teachings and to humanity—The teaching covers the whole of human life—What is your relationship to the world?—It is a wrong question because you are the world.

Krishnamurti (K): Sirs, we started at Rajghat, Benares, by asking if there was a group of people totally committed, not to the school, not to teaching any particular subject, but to what K was talking about—to the *teachings*, if I may use the word. It sounds rather grandiose but is probably a good word. We were asking if there was a group of people committed to the teachings, not to the person, not to some ideation of the person, or to an image of the person, but to what he said. The person is not important, and I really mean it, and it's not just a verbal statement. The teachings are important, and is there a group of people who are completely soaked in it, thoroughly soaked in it, so that they become both the teachers of the teachings and the disciples of the teachings? See the implication of it: that is, one is thoroughly *au fait*, thoroughly *au courant*—thoroughly imbued with it. It is in their blood, not just up here [*points to his head*] but in their blood, so that they not only teach the teachings but are also learning the teachings, so that they are both the teachers and the disciples. I will explain that a bit more as I go along. And we found about four or five, if I am right, at Rajghat who said, 'We will stand by this.' And we discussed for a whole week, day after day, day after day, what the implications of all this were.

And also at Brockwood in England. It is a really beautiful place, a house with forty acres round it, with large trees. Everything is green in England because it rains four months a year. And round the forty acres there is a man who owns a thousand acres. So it is a farmland, and nothing can be built there. There too we said, 'Is there such a group of people who are completely involved in this, not in the school, not in being acquainted with a particular subject and all that, but in this thing?' There were about half a dozen. And we thought it is important that such a nucleus should exist in each place: here, in Madras, Rajghat, and Bangalore.

So could we form such a group who will carry on, not as disciples of K, or as disciples of an idea or a theory, a concept, and so on, but actually study the teachings, live it, flower in it, be passionate about it? And such a group then can either teach, if they want to; or write if they want to, and not be involved in the schools; or go out and talk about it, so that such a group has a living quality, not a repetitive quality. I don't know if I am making myself clear, am I?

PNS: It is a feeling, not just an idea in the mind.

K: It is really an *ashram* in the real, original sense of that word, not all the rotten thing that is going on. So are you all committed to this? First I want to ask that. Not use this as a stepping-stone to something else—wait till you get a better job or a better teaching profession in Lovedale or in Mayo College or in London—but form a nucleus of such people who are totally involved. They may marry, they may have children, but the children will be the future generation of good people because the school will be such a place. In the olden days they took vows of celibacy, shaved their heads, put on robes—which is happening now in Europe and also in this country. We are not like that.

PNS: We are quite clear about that.

K: Quite clear about it. We are people who are free, voluntarily coming in, and voluntarily going out if we don't like it at all. But once you are in, you have got to, by your own honesty and integrity, by your own sense of humility, move from there. If anybody wants to join the nucleus, the door is open. It's not a closed body, it's not a secret body. Now, are we like that, all of us? Please don't say yes or no, think it over. I don't know if you want to think it over. It may not be necessary, or it may be necessary. Then what is the consistency, not the physical consistency, but the intellectual, moral, aesthetic quality of such a group? Are we intellectually capable? Which is, to have a brain that is utterly capable, capable not in a certain direction. Capacity doesn't come through experience. We look to experience and from experience gather capacity. That generally is indicated. I study engineering and develop a certain quality, and that gives me the capacity to be a good engineer. Capacity is not necessary. As you are living, moving, that comes, but if you looked for capacity, it just becomes a rather cheap affair.

AK: Is it the capacity to reason out?

K: I am coming to that. To have such a brain that you can discuss with anybody, right?

PNS: To have an open mind.

K: No. The clarity of the brain.

PNS: Without any fear.

K: Right. That's what I am coming to. To have a brain that is quick, sharp, and catches on quickly without a tremendous lot of explanations and descriptions and all the rest of it. Have you got such a brain? Not an erudite brain. You know, Aldous Huxley once told me—I quote it because it is a very good example—'I can talk about science, I can talk about painting, I can talk about poetry, I can talk about Vedanta, I can talk about Buddhism, Hinduism.' He had an

encyclopaedic memory and knowledge, and he said, ‘As I have got such immense knowledge, I wonder if I can experience anything original?’ You understand?

PNS: Very sad.

K: Isn’t it sad? And that’s why he took to drugs, like LSD and mescaline. We talked about it a while. You know we were friends, and he said, ‘I want to find something original.’ Now, is your brain original so that you can discover something original? Not a repetitive brain. Forgive me if I use the word *Hindu*—the Indian brain is a repetitive brain. Would you agree to that? They read an awful lot and repeat what the Buddha said, what Shankara said, or what the Upanishads or this or that said. So it gradually becomes mechanical, and originality is destroyed completely.

PNS: It is programmed.

K: Programmed. Now, a group of us here have to have a brain that is not conditioned. That is one thing. Go into it a little bit. To face facts absolutely, not translate the facts...

PNS: ...according to one’s images.

K: Yes. But face the fact and not move away from the fact. You know what vitality you get out of that? I wonder if you realize all that? Have you got such brains? I am asking this not out of impudence, please. We have gone beyond that. I am a polite man by nature, and so please accept my sense of non-interference with you. But we must go into this. See, I don’t read any of these books—the Gita, the Upanishads. I have read a great deal of the Old Testament of the Bible for its language. Dr Besant said, ‘If you want to have good English, read the Old Testament.’ Its language is very simple, not like Shakespeare’s, very simple language, with clarity of words. So we can communicate with simple words, not with highfalutin words, not with jargon.

Now, are we committed to this, committed as a group to the teachings and to flower in the teachings? Not repeat the teachings—which is dead—but flower in it so that you become the teachers of the teachings as well as the disciples of the teachings. Which means you wipe away altogether the sense of vanity as a teacher. Which means you have to be terribly honest with yourself and have a sense of great humility; otherwise you can’t learn. You can defend yourself, but you cannot learn. And have a sense of integrity: when you say something you mean it, not double-talk. You know what the word *integrity* means? Integrity means integral, whole. Are we such people? I must come back to that, repeat that. This is what a nucleus demands—that we are a group of people who are free. There is no hierarchy, there is nobody to tell you what to do, what not to do, what to think or what not to think, and no leader, because we are both the teachers and the disciples. Are we such people?

RS: I would like to get one point clarified in this question of commitment. Both in the previous meeting and in this meeting you have been emphasizing this particular term *commitment*. Now, to me it seems that anybody who is committed to the teachings in your sense has also a sense of detachment from the teachings themselves.

K: Detachment?

RS: Yes, he has some kind of detachment.

K: Question it, doubt it, probe into it, tear it to pieces.

RS: So this is my question: a person today says he is committed to the teachings, but in two decades from now something completely different can happen to him: he can undergo a mental derangement, for example.

K: Of course, mental collapse, of course, of course.

RS: So just avowing that I am committed to the teachings is not the whole story.

K: Of course not. Good Lord! You are quite right: it is not. Then let's forget the word *commitment*. Would the word *dedication* be right?

RS: Even that seems not appropriate.

K: All right. Let's change the word. What word would you use for a group of people who are involved, who are concerned, who feel responsibility for the world, feel what the world is, are familiar with what is happening in the world, and as human beings who are part of the world feel totally responsible? Responsible in the sense they have to do something about it, not theorize, not say, 'Yes, that's a terrible war', so on and so on. So would you accept the word and the content of that word *responsibility*?

RS: I would say that it is really responsibility to the whole world.

K: I said that.

RS: But when you say 'responsibility to the teachings' or 'commitment'...

K: Wait, sir. Responsibility to the world. The world is what we have made it, what human beings have made it. So, as I am a human being, I have made it. I will not make the world as it is only if I am out of it, not physically but psychologically, which is, having no fear, having love, compassion and the quality of intelligence that comes with compassion. For that I am responsible—to live that way, to be concerned, to be responsible, and to be able to cooperate together, because that is what is missing in the world. They cooperate for a

personal motive and so on, but here we have no personal motive, I hope. We have to go into that—personal motive—very carefully. So what word, what phrase, what paragraph will describe all that?

RD: Krishnaji, one feels responsible, but the responsibility becomes limited by the ‘me’: the motive comes in.

K: Don’t bring in the ‘me’. Where there is responsibility you forget yourself, right? If I am responsible for this school, for its guidance, for its sustenance, and all the rest of it, I forget myself. The school is more important than me. If I feel responsible, I have forgotten myself. It is not the ‘me’ that is preventing the responsibility and the fullness of it. I don’t know if I have made myself clear.

RD: It seems that there are two forces going on: either the ‘me’ is operating or responsibility.

K: No. Look, sir. I am responsible, say, for Brockwood. I better not say Brockwood because I am here. I am responsible, I feel that way. Please believe me, I feel that way when I am here. I feel tremendously responsible. Not only to the people concerned here but to the land, the trees, the flowers, the beauty of the valley. To me a tree is a sacred thing. A tree is to me the most marvellous thing on the earth. Like a tiger is a marvellous thing. Now, I feel responsible. So where does the ‘me’ exist in this at all?

HP: What happens now is that a person feels strongly responsible for the school, but then he may have some ideas about the way it should be.

K: I said carefully: responsibility means cooperation. If I can cooperate, I drop my opinions, my convictions. Would you agree to all this?

HP: Yes.

K: Now, to describe all that what word would you use?

RT: Apart from each one having his own or her own ideas about responsibility...

K: Ah, ah. You and I have no separate ideas about responsibility; we are responsible.

RT: Yes, but there is a division. When I was talking to some of my younger colleagues yesterday, one of the issues they raised, and which I said they should raise here today, was that there seems to be a division between practicability and the ideal.

K: Go on, sir, explain.

PNS: I would like to tell you about what a person told me: he said we are not being practical, we are being idealistic. That is, we have a lot of rich children who are the sons of politicians. We ask for their favours, so they come and put their children here, and we yield to them and thus spoil the school. And so I said we would have just five children here or a hundred children, and not all this group. He then said I was not being practical because they would get the electricity cut and so on. So I said, 'Let's have no electricity, let's have no water.'

K: Hey! [*Laughs*] Sir, just a minute. When I came here with SR, there was no water, there was just one well. We slept on the floor. We had lamps lit by kerosene, and they didn't function properly. We did everything. There were no toilets. You want to go back to that?

PNS: No, we don't want to go back to that, but when that situation comes...

K: Wait, sir. Go into it very carefully. Don't take sides, don't be definite, don't be definite; let's examine. The moment you are definite you are taking a stand. Let the ball roll. If you take a stand, then you become divisive. So if you and I are concerned, we are concerned not with rich children or poor children—they are children.

PNS: I understand that.

K: Yes, sir. Now let's go on. What phrase will you use for this? You don't like the words *dedication*, *committed*, or *involved*.

PNS: Sir, we can use the words *responsibility to mankind*.

K: No, not mankind. Responsibility, a feeling of tremendous responsibility.

Q1: Are you objecting to the word *committed* or to the word *teaching*?

RS: Committed to something. I mention this because if one gets committed to some particular thing, then immediately there is a division, and one stands in opposition to the things to which one is not committed.

K: No, sir. You are serious, I am not. You are committed, you are serious, I am not—there is division. You are jolly, you are clever, you are bright, you have got brains, and I haven't got—there is division. There is no equality in the world. Dr Bohm has got a good, first-class brain, and I haven't got it. Right? You are doubtful?

RS: Yes, I am doubtful. [*Laughter*]

K: Why? If you don’t like to take Bohm or Wilkins or one of these top people, take Einstein. My God! I am not Einstein. Take the physical—you are beautiful, I am not. What are you objecting to?

RS: It was about commitment, you know.

K: Yes. So we remove that word. You are objecting to a word that might imply a divisive quality.

SP: I would like to point out something: people have been committed to Gandhism or to something else. It is a static concept, a static framework. Whereas here what are we committed to? To a moving, dynamic process of perception, a process of living, therefore there is no stagnation here. What creates division is stagnation, not movement.

RH: In the same way that the teaching is not a dogma...

SP: ...and therefore it will not be divisive.

AP: Can I say that the word *commitment* in India is a very loaded word? We talk of a committed bureaucracy, a committed judiciary, which means standing in a certain relationship to the Establishment. The communists use the word in a certain way. We are not using it in that way. Here we know that there is acting from confusion, or acting with clarity, and we say that unless we act with clarity, there is no right relationship with the teaching itself. So we are determined never to allow confusion as regards the teaching to find a place in our life because we must face the teaching with absolute honesty and clarity.

K: I think he is up against the feeling that any form of commitment, dedication, identification brings it all down to a very narrow point of view, which will then create division. Right?

RS: Yes, sir.

K: Now, suppose you are interested in mathematics or physics or whatever it is, that very study, the very prolonged years of investigation and experience, sets you apart from me who is a carpenter. We are talking not of functions, right? We are talking not of function or status, but of a teaching which involves the whole of existence, of human life. You agree to that?

RS: Yes.

K: And in that I am totally interested. I am involved in it, perhaps you may not be; that immediately creates a division, but I have not the spirit of division. You may have it, but I have not. So what is it now? After saying all this, what is it that we are trying? We won’t use the word *commitment*, we won’t use *dedication*, we

won’t use any of these worn-out words, but say ‘a feeling of responsibility to the teachings and to humanity’.

RS: Yes, that conveys it.

K: Right. Let’s proceed from there. Are we such people? I must come back to it over and over again. It does not mean that you may not marry, it does not mean that you are stuck here for the rest of your life. Not in Rishi Valley; but I mean you are not stuck to something which, to me, is real. You can say, ‘I am sorry, I am off.’ It is your choice, right?

RS: Yes.

K: Are we such a group? I will tell you why I am asking this question. Because we are getting old: I am eighty-seven. I am sure to die, perhaps five years later or ten years later. I may go in a car, have an accident, and that’ll be the end of it. Now, there must be some people—not disciples, not those who take on my mantle and all that nonsense.

PNS: Not propagandists.

K: Not propagandists, but who are alive with this thing. Now, this is said not out of conceit, this is said not out of some kind of possessive attachment to the teaching: I think this teaching covers the whole of human existence. I don’t know if you have studied it. It covers the whole of human life, from the physical to the most inward depth of human beings. So there is nothing in it that sets it apart as a cult, as something or the other. When you look into it, you say, ‘My God.’ I personally look at it as a marvellous thing, not because I have said it, but because it is something extraordinarily life-giving. And that life-giving thing can never go dry. Like a spring well, it can never go dry. To me it is so, otherwise I wouldn’t have spent a day on it. I would just become a carpenter or something else.

Now, are we such a group? If we are, then what is our relationship to the school, what is our relationship to the world, and what is our relationship to each other? I begin with the world: what is our relationship with the world? What is our relationship to the environment, which is our school? The environment is not only the school but the whole earth. And what is our relationship with each other? Please be critical.

Q2: As soon as we have a school, as long as we have any institution, we get into a human dynamics which, if not now, at least after a particular point of time, brings about division. Any institution...

K: Any institution is death. You have seen political or religious organizations, organizations such as the *ashrama*—they all end up dry, like dry river-beds. We have got a school; that school was intended from its origin, when it first began, to bring about good human beings, excellent human beings, excellent not in

academics, but human beings with great affection, charity, and all that. So far it has not—forgive me—it has not succeeded. But now that you are all here, you young people, you might do it. You might help the students, you follow? That's up to you. That's why I am asking: 'What is your responsibility, your relationship to the world, not to India, but your relationship to the vast group of people? And what is your relationship to the school and with each other?' These three are important. Relationship means responsibility. Of course I am related to my children because I have borne them, or rather my wife and I have borne them, and we are responsible for them. So what is your relationship to the vast humanity? Perhaps that's a wrong question. I am going to explain why I think it is a wrong question. That's why you are stuck and are not answering it. I said, 'What is your responsibility or relationship to the world?' It is a wrong question. You ought to have spotted it, not me.

Q2: The answer is not immediately perceivable.

K: No, it is a wrong question. I will show you in a minute. You are the world. That is a truth, not just a verbal assertion. The world has been created by human beings; as you are a human being you have created it. You *are* that. You *are* the society; society is not different from you. If you want to change society, you have to change. Right, sir? Don't agree. So wipe out that question 'What is your relationship?' Got it?

PNS: Yes.

K: What? Tell me. I have purposely stopped there. I first asked a wrong question, which is: what is your relationship with the world? It is a wrong question because the world, not the physical world, but the human world, the society, the politics, the religion, the whole invention of man you have created through your fears, greed, and so on. So if you want to change that, you have to change yourself. So your relationship is not to the world. Go on, tell me. You are bright people. Come on, sirs.

Q1: The word *relationship* itself says that you are different from the rest.

K: So the word *relationship* isn't right. Then what? Do you see something in this? Which is, the moment you establish a relationship it means division.

PNS: Me and you.

K: No. You have divided it already by the use of that word *relationship*. The word *relationship* means I am related to something.

PNS: Language is not very adequate.

K: Therefore break it up. We will find the right word. When we use the word *relationship*, it implies a divisive process. So when you recognize that you are the world and the world is you, there is no division in that at all; therefore the word *relationship* doesn't exist. I wonder if you get this?

PNS: Yes.

K: So what then are you?

PNS: You have no 'you'.

K: No, sir. Look at it carefully. I am the world. Do we realize that? Not verbally, but the feeling of it, the quality of it, the strength of it, the beauty, the vitality of such a statement that I am actually the world. What do you say?

HP: When you say, 'I am the world', at that moment you are not the world.

K: No. That is a mere description. I am not quoting the description, I am just asking. What do you say?

RS: I think the only thing is to change oneself.

K: No, no. Careful.

Q2: I understand that as an idea, but to feel that I am the world...

K: That is why I said: that is the truth, but do you see that?

PNS: We see ourselves in the children: we see the confusion, the corruption.

K: Not only that, not only that. Every human being in the world goes through some kind of torture, some kind of agony; we go through all that. So there is no division. But there is a division if I say, 'I am this', and hold to that; then there is division.

PNS: Then there is a commitment to something.

K: You get it?

PNS: Yes.

K: Right. Now let's proceed. So I won't use the words *my relationship with the world*. But I will use the words *relationship to the school*. What is my responsibility to the school? What is a school? The origin of that word, in Greek, Latin, and so on, is 'leisure'. See the importance of it: leisure. Only when we have leisure we learn. Would you agree to that? I am asking this question

because the school is different; it is practical. It is children we are dealing with, not grown-up people. What is our relationship or responsibility to those who are here? Not to the future generation or the past generation, but to those who are here. What is my responsibility, what is my relationship to them? You may not teach, you may not teach them mathematics or history or geography or English, but you are here. This is your environment, and what is your responsibility, relationship to the environment? Go on. This makes you sit up and think. If I use the word *responsibility* with regard to the world, that responsibility implies a division: I am responsible for. But when I realize that I am the world and the world is me, not verbally but in my blood, in my heart, in my feeling, in the depth of it, then there is no division at all; I am that. Not I am Brahman or anything; I am that, which is the world. Therefore I won't use the words *responsibility* or *relationship*. I am that. If I want to change the world, that is, the society, I have to begin here; that's all.

Then we ask: what is our responsibility as a group who are the nucleus? Let's use the word *nucleus*, which we understand. What is the responsibility of the nucleus to the environment, which is the school we find ourselves in? What is our responsibility? I may not teach mathematics, geography. I am not a teacher, but I like to be among the nucleus of such people. You are apparently such a nucleus. I come from Bangalore or further away, from England or Amritsar. I come from Amritsar and say, 'By Jove, they are such a serious group of people, I like to join them.' I have studied, I have meditated, I have gone into this, and when I meet such people I say, 'By Jove, there is somebody whom I can talk to.' But what is my responsibility or my relationship to my environment, which happens to be the school?

PNS: It is everything: it is how I live, how I walk, how I talk.

K: Yes, sir, go into it, go into it. What is our responsibility as a body? It's not my thing; but as a body of people who are serious, who are involved, who feel responsible, who feel they must create a new generation in themselves, in their environment, how will you deal with the school, which is functional? How will you organize, knowing the dangers of organization, knowing that the rich will come, that the poor, the uneducated cannot come? You know all that. They are children. What shall I do? I am not a teacher, I don't know mathematics, geography. So what do I feel about the schools?

Q2: You observe.

K: I have observed. The school is there.

Q3: Is it not to care? Total care of the environment?

K: What does that mean?

Q3: Total care means taking each and every thing and seeing what it is.

K: So care means what? Affection.

Q3: Yes, it is total affection.

K: Go into it much deeper than that. Care! Care for how they walk, how they eat, what kind of food they eat and whether it is too hot, how they dress, their taste for clothes, their combing the hair, their beds, their mosquito nets, the bath, the soap, the water. Care! Do you feel that way?

RS: Yes. That's why I come to the school, only for this reason.

K: Care! I care for the land. The moment I have that feeling of care, it implies all that. Care for the trees, for the plants, for the flowers, for the land, for the water. So I can do the same with the students. I may not be able to teach mathematics, but I care for them. I wonder if you see this?

PNS: I see it very clearly, sir.

K: So what does it mean? As far as I am concerned, the school in Ojai, California, in England and the four schools here are one school. They are far away, divided by land, by miles and miles, but it is all under one umbrella, so there is no fissiparous tendency in all these schools; it isn't north and south and all that kind of stuff. I care. So I offer to work for two hours, three hours, four hours, and I stick to it. I will look after it, do it. Because I care, I am interested in clothes, in good taste; I will see to it, I will study it. I am helping, you follow? Is this impractical? The moment you care you are practical. Are we such a people? Because we are creating the future generation. Right, sirs? [*Pause*]

I've got a European suit, forty-five years old; I can still use it. Do you know why? I was taken to the best tailor in London, and I've still got it. I've got a pair of shoes of 1925—you understand? The feeling of care. Those who looked after me said 'care'. Similarly I am watchful, of how the students sleep, how they walk, what they talk. You see what happens? If I care, I am also caring about how I behave, what I think. The school is me, I am the teacher and the disciple. Got it?

Rishi Valley, 7 December 1982

2

Is Our Relationship Based on Function?

Taking the initiative to form a nucleus—On trust—Are we of the same mind, the same intention?—You are both the teachers and disciples of the teachings—No status, only function—Is our relationship based on function?—If it is based on an activity, an ideal, it has no meaning—How do you convey all this to the student?—I want to help the student, through mathematics, to come to have such intelligence—Attention, love, compassion, and intelligence go together—On disagreement and learning.

Krishnamurti (K): Would you take the initiative and form such a nucleus yourself, a nucleus of people, a group of people who come together, seeing what the world is, what is happening in this country? Would each one of you take the initiative to gather such people, work together, create a new culture, a new way of living? Would you take such an initiative, or if someone took such an initiative, as we are doing now, would you join them?—those who are not nationalistic, not political, not so-called religious, but are really concerned with the whole global problem, not parochial problems. In the greater the lesser is included. They want to create a new culture, a new vitality—you understand? Would we be such a group? (Or would you all wait to be told, wait for some new leader, new politician, new guru, and then follow like sheep?) Since you are here, apparently that is what *you* want to do. Let's be clear. This is what you want to do, isn't it? Right. If so, what do you think we ought to do, all of us together? We talked about it the day before yesterday when we met here. Our relationship to the world—we understood that it was a wrong question. We talked about our relationship to the school, which will, which must, create a good human being who is not merely academically efficient, academically disciplined. Also, what is our relationship to each other? Are we of the same thought, the same mind? Or do we approach it from our own particular little point of view? What do you say?

RS: We have to find this out.

K: You have had four days, you can't take a year. The house is burning; you can't say, 'Well, I'll wait, I'll take time and see how to get the bucket, the pipe or whatever it is'; you work.

HP: If we start with this idea of creating a group, probably we will not succeed, but if it happens it would be something really marvellous.

K: It never happens by itself. A school doesn't happen by itself. Marriage between man and woman doesn't happen by itself. Here we are; I happened to invite you, unfortunately or fortunately, and it took place. My question is: are we

all of the same mind? In Rajghat we gathered a group of people who, I hope, have the same mind or are in the same movement. So wouldn't it be good if you could form all over India such groups who are not nationalistic, not political, not Maharashtra against Telugu or Tamil, and all the rest of it, but who are human beings? Are we of the same mind?

RS: Basically yes.

K: What is 'basically yes', and why do you say 'basically'? Are you thinking in terms of how it'll work out?

RS: Yes, how to implement it.

K: The implementation comes later. The implementation, the working it out, is a small affair, but if we are all together in this, the thing flows. I don't have to plan out what we do, but if we are all together in the same boat, each man pulls the oar. First, before we go to the practical side of it, are we, all of us here in this room, of the same mind, cooperating to bring this about, in ourselves, in the world?

PNS: Sir, we must drop our particular beliefs and particular ideas.

K: It's not an idea.

PNS: No, we must drop ours if we want to have that.

K: Of course, of course, that is understood.

Q1: The change must first come in us. To bring about a change outwardly, the change has to come first in ourselves.

K: No, no, no. If you say it has to come first with us, that we must be good human beings before we can transmit it to others, then we will wait till Doomsday.

Q1: Can we do it simultaneously?

K: If that is our intention, if that is our deep responsibility, then in helping the students we are helping ourselves. It is mutual learning, mutual activity; it's not just an isolated activity—first I am enlightened, then I'll help the world—which is nonsense, really. If I am not enlightened and you are not enlightened, if we both are seeking that light, then we teach other, help each other to understand. In relationship this thing moves, not in isolation. Do you agree to that?

HP: All politicians gather with some common purpose, but then it doesn't work out because everyone has his own ambition.

K: That's why I asked, are we of the same mind? Do we all want to do the same thing?

PNS: I really wonder if we are all of the same mind?

K: That's what I keep on asking.

Q1: Usually we think that when we want to do something, we are all of the same mind, but when it comes to practicalities...

K: No, we are not *doing* anything. Before we *do* something, we must be clear we are all together. Do we all want to build a house, a new house, symbolically? If we all do then we say, 'Which is the best architect, what is the foundation, what is the best wood?' and so on and get on with it. But if some of us want to do the house and the rest don't, then it becomes a conflict: then you build and I tear down. This is generally what happens. That's why I keep on asking, if I may: are we of the same mind, the same urge, the same intention, the same outlook?

Q1: I can see it for myself, but I don't know.

K: That's why I am asking each one.

Q1: Even when we are of the same mind, we see we have certain ideas even at the functional level.

K: I don't think that even at the functional level ideas matter. This we will have to go into a little later, but please see how difficult it is.

Q1: I feel responsible.

K: You feel responsible, but does each one of us feel responsible? Put it any way you like. This is a serious question, don't brush it off. This is a serious question, because nobody by himself can do anything. He can influence, he can do other things, but he cannot create something. Building a house by oneself would take a century, but together it might take ten days. So are we all together in this—that we want to create a new culture, a new outlook on life, a global human structure? All right, it is for you to decide. Then we asked, what is our relationship as a group to the schools which we have? One may teach there or may not teach there. I might not want to teach, but I am part of the group. That must be understood: I am part of the group and I *may* teach.

PNS: But there are chances of mistaking a statement like 'I may not teach, I may do something else'; then there are chances of their taking comfort and relaxing. So they have to be very serious.

K: That's what I am saying. Unless you are serious, don't join in this matter. That's very clear, right? If I am not serious, I won't come to you. Even if I am half serious I'll play with it, but soon I will find out that you are much too serious, so I drop out. Now, what is our relationship to the school? Or what is our activity if it is not with the school? I may not teach, but I may write, I may go out and talk. It isn't that we all must teach in the school; that would be absurd. But if you undertake to teach, then you are teachers there, and in the other direction you are both the teachers and disciples of the teachings. Then what is our relationship with each other? Which is more important? Come on, sir, you tell me, let's discuss it. What's our relationship with each other?

Q1: I think there should be complete trust.

K: What do you mean 'should be'? How can you trust me? You don't know me.

Q1: If somebody says we are all going to do something together, I would.

K: No, just find out. I say I am all with you, I am entirely with all of you, I'm serious. How can you trust me? What do you mean by trusting me? How does trust arise? The word *trust* is rather difficult; it is a rather complicated word, the content of that word is a great deal. Could you change that word to something else? I come here, I join you, and I see that you are all serious; so am I. You are all doing something together either in the school or in different directions. I may undertake to do gardening; that's good enough for me. There is no status: there is only function. I come to you, I am slightly slack, inherently lazy. Or I am not very honest to myself. Will you help me to be honest? Not by telling me, 'You are dishonest', but by your very conduct, by your very activity you show me how tremendously honest you are and that I must change. Otherwise we begin to analyse each other, criticize each other, and break up soon. You entrust me with gardening and soon find out that I am rather slack; how will you help me? Go on, tell me what to do. Or I say I agree, but I do not agree basically, deeply—you know the game we all play. So that's why I am asking, what is our relationship to each other, actually? There is Mr S from Rajghat; what's my relationship to him? I'm one of the people here in this school; I don't travel north, but I meet him here and I ask, what's my relationship to him? Is my relationship established through work—he is a principal, I am a teacher? Is our relationship based on function? We must clear up all these things.

PNS: Like the clerk and the manager.

K: Yes, that's it: he is the principal, I am only a teacher. So I must find out what's my relationship as a teacher, as one of the group here, to S. What's my relationship to him? He is in the same group, only he has moved to the north or to Madras or to Bangalore or to Bombay. What's my relationship with him? Do I meet him at the functional level? How do I meet him?

Q2: He belongs to the same family, he is like a family member.

K: Be careful about the use of the word *family*. Be careful with words. Actually, what's your relationship with S? Look at it carefully, don't answer it yet. I don't know yet; I am inquiring, I am asking myself. I've known him for the last four years and I ask, what's my relationship to him?

AK: We have the same mind?

K: Have we the same mind? No, come on, we have not the same mind.

AK: I mean the same purpose.

K: Purpose? No. I don't even want to introduce the word *purpose*. What's my relationship to a man who is a part of my horizon, part of a group? What's my relationship to you? What's your relationship to her? What's your relationship to him or to any of us? If it is not at the functional level, then at what level do you have a relationship?

AP: You said something very significant: though we are in Rishi Valley or Rajghat or Bangalore or Ojai or Brockwood, there is really only one nucleus. It is really the need of the world to begin a totally new...

K: That's right.

AP: And if this feeling is shared—that we are beginning at a level which nobody in the world is giving this tremendous priority to—that is the starting point.

K: That's right, sir, absolutely. You are quite right.

AP: If we can all share that, then perhaps we would be able to have...

K: You are right. Have you heard what he said? There is a group in Ojai; they are working like I can't tell you how hard, though the whole country is against it—vulgarity, money, drugs, a tremendous sense of amusement, affluence; I can't tell you what's going on in that country. There are a few people there at Ojai who are working very hard, against great odds. At Brockwood, they are living on a shoestring and working like fury to keep the thing going. Fortunately, the house, the grounds have been bought. We don't rent it, otherwise we would have collapsed long ago. About four or five people there are working. There is the Rajghat School, which has had all kinds of difficulties over the last forty years—legal difficulties, strikes, and so on. Then there is Rishi Valley, which has gone on lamely, like a lame duck, for a long time. Now at least there are some people here. And there in Bombay only very, very, very few people are interested because it is for poor children, so nobody cares. If it were a rich school, then they would have poured money if their children went there. So they are also working

very hard. And in Madras and Bangalore too. As he pointed out, we are all in the same boat. Ojai, Brockwood, Madras, Bombay, Rishi Valley, Rajghat, Bangalore—we are all in the same boat, we are all people who are really concerned.

Now, what is our relationship to each other? As he pointed out, such a group doesn't exist in the world. They exist under the leadership of Mahesh Yogi or Sai Baba or some other guru. But we are not like that, fortunately. We are one body working together, right?

PNS: With freedom.

K: Yes, with freedom. Quite right. Otherwise it's dead from the beginning. Now, what is our relationship to all this?

HP: It seems we do not have any exchange programme for teachers to go from one school to other schools.

K: No, I am not talking of that. All that can come later when we have money, because we have thought a great deal about it. Exchange of teachers, exchange of students can take place if we all agree, if we all want it. One year I go to Brockwood, one year to Ojai, one year to Madras, or Rajghat; that's simple, that can be arranged very simply. But before we start that, we must be absolutely clear that such a group doesn't exist in the world.

AP: There are groups which exist for banning the bomb, which are relevant to what we are saying: they want to approach it from the periphery.

K: Yes, that's just it.

AP: But we say this is the only group which distinguishes itself from all the rest.

K: That's right.

AP: We say we don't start at the periphery, we start at the centre. There are not ten people who even understand the meaning of it; they are cynical. That is, the world has not even given you the credibility of saying that here is something authentic, new.

K: Yes, sir.

AP: We have that at least, as a starting point.

K: That's what I am asking, the same thing: are we of the same mind? What do you say?

Q1: I think we are.

K: If we are, what's our relationship to each other?

Q1: That very commonness of purpose is our relationship.

K: You see, don't put a purpose in relationship. The ideal draws us, the purpose makes us comfortable.

Q1: It is not an ideal.

K: No. I am saying: if you say 'purpose', it is the same thing. Look at it: if you say 'a purpose', the purpose draws us; if you say 'an ideal', the ideal draws us. Or a person draws us. We are not like that, right? So what's our relationship? Give a little thought to it. You will see it for yourself in a minute.

Q3: Is there, in our relationship, cooperation?

K: We are cooperating; if we are together we are cooperating. But I insist on asking this question, please.

GN: I think the relationship is not hierarchical first; it is in freedom, and so a responsibility arises which is not imposed by another person.

K: That's it. Go on, go into it a little more deeply. Find out what's your relationship with me, what's your relationship to her. Find out, dig into it a little bit.

Q1: Would you say it is communion?

K: Yes, of course, of course, we communicate. But go into it. I want to get at something deeper, and once we get it everything becomes easy.

RD: It is a relationship based on facts.

K: Yes.

RD: We perceive something as a fact, together.

K: Together. I understand.

RD: I perceive the fact, and you perceive the fact. The fact is our common ground.

K: That is, would you say our common ground is—I won't say it. Go on, pick it up, pick up some more pieces. Don't guess what I think.

Q3: Would the common ground be our very presence here? Would it be an understanding of relationship?

K: Now, what is your relationship with Mr S, who comes from Rajghat? What's my relationship to him? Make it direct, you will find out; don't be theoretical about it.

RS: I would make him feel completely at home here.

K: He is at home, what's your relationship?

Q3: The same type of work we are involved in?

K: You see, when you say 'work', 'purpose', 'goal', 'ideal', they are all the same thing. I am related to you because we are building a house together. When the house is not built, we break up. We are together because we *say* we are together, we are related because we are all building the house. But when the house is built, we break up. If our relationship is based on a purpose, an activity, an ideal, around a person, it has no meaning at depth. Right?

Q2: In depth, I am not different from Mr S.

K: Ah, you *are* different.

Q2: No. Physically I am different, but at one level I am not different. I am different from him at the functional level, at the physical level, but at a deeper level I am not different from him.

K: So what? Go on, pursue that.

AM: We meet as human beings. Our relationship is one of one human being to another, not through function.

HP: Is it necessary to know a person to have a feeling of friendship?

K: There he is, sir, ask him. Ask what his relationship to you is. You are not being direct, that's what is upsetting. You are all theoretical. Please, I am asking you: what's our relationship to each other? Whether I live in Ojai, in England, in Rajghat, or Bombay, what's my relationship to a group which says, 'Look, we are free human beings trying to create a new etc., etc.'?

Q3: I'm learning from them.

K: Yes, yes. Go on, find out a little more. You are bright people, what's the matter with you?

KJ: Would you say there is affection, caring, and listening?

K: They have said this in different words.

PNS: I will not get hurt.

K: No, no, don't think in those terms. Now, wait a minute, I'll show you something. I am taking something practical: what's your relationship with me? Carefully think it out. Don't just use words, but find the feeling, then use the right word, then we get to each other. What's your relationship with me, and what's my relationship with you? You are a teacher, I am the pupil and the disciple. I don't know if you have understood that.

PNS: Yes, I've understood that.

K: Profoundly! I am a teacher of what K has been talking about, and you are a disciple of that, so am I. Carefully listen. You are that, I am that. Right? I am the teacher and the disciple.

PNS: You are not superior to me.

K: No, no. What's our relationship?

Q3: We are equal, we are on the same level.

K: No.

Q1: The word *relationship* is confusing at this juncture.

K: Go into yourself; if you can, go into yourself and find out what relationship means with another, what is the nature of relationship, the content, the depth of it, the beauty of it, the vitality of it. What do you say? This is really, really good; this makes your brain work, not in the traditional sense. All of you are expressing the traditional sense. Break the traditional sense, look at it differently.

Q1: I am on a quest for something which is true, and so are you, and that is our relationship.

K: We both, you and I, are drinking at the same well, drinking the same water. Now what? She and I are drinking the same water, at the same well. She may have a different pitcher, and I may have a different pitcher. Mine may break very easily because it is made of terracotta, and hers may be stainless steel, but we are drinking the same water. Go into it, don't use words till you are clear. My God, this will make you think! I'm glad you are stuck with it. Got something, sir?

HP: When we are related, we cannot talk about what relationship is.

K: No, I can. I tell my wife, ‘I love you.’ We are going to put it clearly in a minute or two, if you go into it. The teaching says: Relationship cannot exist if you have an image about him or he has an image about you; that means we are both running on parallel lines, never meeting. Now, where do we meet? If you are a man and I am a woman, we meet in bed.

Q2: As long as we have images about ourselves...

K: I’ve said that, sir. Go into it, for God’s sake. Very interesting, isn’t it? All right, let’s forget this question for the moment; we’ll come back to it a little later. We are a group of people who are really concerned, responsible—we won’t use the word *committed* or *dedicated*. We are responsible, we are cooperative, we are free people belonging to no group, no sect, no nationality, no religion. We are very thoughtful, live people. Now, how do you translate all this to a student who joins you? This is not a closed circle, right? There is a door open. How will you make those students say, ‘My God, these people have something which I must have; these people are extraordinarily alive, extraordinarily sensitive, bright, intelligent, and we want to come and join them’? How will you help them to come to be like that? I am a mathematics teacher, how will I help them through mathematics?

PNS: Absolute honesty in what I am teaching.

K: Yes, yes, I am keen on mathematics. I want to help that student, through mathematics, to come to have such intelligence. He sees that you are extraordinarily alive, all the rest of it, and you want to help him to come to your excellence. What will you do? You are a teacher of mathematics; how will you move in that direction and help him to be both the teacher and the student of the whole of it—the teachings, its beauty, all the rest? How will you help him?

AK: We explore together.

K: Yes, explore together. Then what? How will you help him to have a mind, a brain, that is alive, creative? Have you got such a mind?

PNS: I think so.

K: You can’t say, ‘I think so.’ Then you haven’t got it. That’s a conjecture. Do you get what I am saying? So, is your brain extraordinarily sensitive, sensitive to nature, to colour? Or is it partly alive, partly dead? Or is it thinking along a certain line, stuck in a groove? Investigate all this, sir.

PNS: It is not whole.

K: Yes, go on. What is your relationship with another who is not whole? Go on, investigate, pull the threads out of it. You have got this global mind—let’s call it

global—and I haven't got it. How will you help me perceive the quality of that—not the words, but the quality, the depth, the dignity, the vitality of that? Wouldn't you begin at the level which I will understand?

PNS: Fundamental.

K: Yes. At the basic, grassroots level, won't you? Which means you say, 'Look at how you eat, what you do.' And you point out to me what nationalism does. Build it, lay the foundation, build it, build it, build it. So, at the end of a year, you have got him without your doing anything about it. I wonder if you understand what I am saying?

PNS: It is clear to me, I have done it.

K: That's right.

RS: Could you repeat what you said?

K: The other day I was talking to some politician in Delhi; he said we must give confidence at the grassroots level, confidence to the man who has no confidence, to the labourer, the mass, as he called it, and they were working at that, giving confidence so that he can work properly.

You are my teacher in Bangalore; how will you bring about a quality of mind or brain that is global, that is concerned with humanity, concerned with all the horrors that are going on? How will you help me to have that as your student? And I was saying: Won't you begin at the lowest level—with how I eat, what I do, what I talk—then move to the national level, show how nations are destroying each other, so that gradually you show me what humans have done to themselves and to each other, so that from your verbal structure I begin to see the depth of it for myself? Because all that you do, you feel, you are putting into words, and those words are giving me the depth of it. So you build it up—the foundation, the walls, the windows—till the house is complete.

Now, what does all that imply? Don't answer me quickly. What does all this imply?

GN: Communication.

K: Yes, you have communicated. Move. You have communicated, helped me. What's the meaning of all this?

Q2: It's freeing, unconditioning.

K: You are breaking my conditioning. I come from a family which has conditioned me; you are helping to break it up. I say, 'Don't be silly, look at the world, broken up; don't belong to that kind of stupidity, wake up' and so on.

What does all that imply? When you have created it in me, what has it done to me?

Q1: You become very sensitive?

K: Yes, I have done that.

Q2: You have expanded me.

PNS: You've made the child more intelligent.

K: What do you mean by that word *intelligence*? Why have you done this to me? Why have you taken this immense trouble to build me? Why? Go on, sir, don't be shy of that word.

PNS: Compassion?

K: Care, compassion, love, attention.

PNS: Responsibility.

K: Yes. Responsibility, care, affection, love, compassion—what does all that imply? Isn't that an action of intelligence? Because, you cannot be compassionate without intelligence. You cannot have care without intelligence. So all that is a movement of intelligence. The non-intelligence is nationality, all that. Now you have created a movement of intelligence in me; because you are intelligent, you have created it in me. Are you like that? Then what happens? You are a member of this group, you have that feeling. Then you meet S from Rajghat; what's your relationship to him?

Sir, when you invite a guest, what's your feeling about a guest? You won't invite somebody whom you don't like. You have a house, you invite somebody whom you like, who is a friend, who is a companion with whom you can talk and discuss. As he is a guest you welcome him, give him the best bedroom. Then what takes place in that? Between the guest and you who own the house, what takes place when you treat me that way?

Q2: I will be very happy.

K: Yes, what does that mean? Go into it. He is a friend of yours, and you open the door to your house; what does that mean?

RH: You are welcome.

K: Yes. Isn't it? You are welcome. Why don't you use these simple words? He's welcome, and then what happens? You say, 'Come and sit down, let's talk.' Because you care, right? Would you say that care and intelligence go together?

Attention and love and compassion and intelligence go together. I cannot be compassionate if I am a Catholic. Are you quite sure?

PNS: Yes.

K: Why?

PNS: Because you have a purpose.

K: Because you have a purpose. Or I am anchored in Jesus. So I cannot be compassionate if I am a Catholic, a Hindu, a Buddhist—you follow? And he comes from Rajghat, and he has said, 'I am free of all that', and you have also said that. So there it is. You have established it. So now let's come down. What shall we do together? What shall we who are going to be here, in Madras, in Rajghat, in Bombay, do? What do we all do together? You can't go to Bombay, obviously you are here, but the endeavour is together. Though Rajghat is miles away, it is a cooperative venture of a people who are really free. So together—what does that mean? Will you have dissension? Quarrel? Disagreement? Go into it, don't say yes or no. Will you have disagreement? What do you say?

Q1: We might, but we would be willing to look at it.

K: 'We might.' Why?

Q1: There are bound to be occasions when we do get stuck in certain ideas, but we must be open to see that we are stuck in the ideas.

K: So which is more important—first quarrel and then see the idea?

Q1: No.

K: Wait, wait, take it slowly. I am asking you, 'Is it necessary to have dissension, to have disagreement or agreement, or a divisive process acting?' Is it necessary? You understand the word *divisive*? Why should we have any disagreement? The world functions on disagreement. I agree to work with you or I don't agree to work with you as long as I have something to gain or not to gain and so on. But why do we have to have disagreement at all? This is really important, please give a little thought to it. Why should we have disagreement amongst ourselves? Why?

Q2: Because we try to project our opinions.

K: Yes. Why do you have opinions? What a waste of energy.

Q2: Yes.

K: Don’t say yes. If you see that it is a wastage of energy, it is finished, you don’t have them. That is intelligence. You see something false and wipe it out immediately. Not say, ‘I’ll stick to my opinions’, but yield to you. Now, can we ask ourselves why we should have any kind of agreement or disagreement? On that basis the world functions, but we are not functioning on that. So why should we have disagreement? Does disagreement arise through function? I undertake to do gardening or carpentry or cooking, and I am at it, and you come and examine it and say, ‘Do it in a different way’, or suggest it. I get irritated because I am doing my best; I say, ‘Why do you interfere with it?’ Then we begin to—right? So I ask, why do we have such disagreement?

I want to learn, right? While I am learning, I can’t agree or disagree. I wonder if you see this? You see, I am a teacher and a disciple. You get that into your blood. Then I am learning if you come and say, ‘Look, your cooking is rotten.’ I am learning. I say, ‘Right, sir, tell me.’ If the root, the core, of it is understood, that you are both the teacher and the disciple, that we are a group, then when you criticize me, I say, ‘Quite right, let’s look at it’—if I am learning. I am not learning when I have opinions, judgements, conclusions, and I stick to them. So disagreement—or agreement—is a total waste of time when I am learning.

The other day at Brockwood a man came up to me and said, ‘Sir, you are a beautiful old man, but you are stuck in a rut.’ I said, ‘By Jove, is that so?’ I didn’t say, ‘No, sir, I am not’, or anything. I said, ‘Is that so?’ As I walked from the tent to the door of the kitchen—it takes about two minutes—I said, ‘Now, am I stuck in a groove?’ I quickly went through it, I realized I was not. I was honest about it. So I went to him the next morning and said, ‘Sorry, sir, your statement is not quite accurate’, and I then went into it. Finished. I didn’t say, ‘You are wrong, I am right.’

So if we are all learning, then there is no problem. But we are also teachers of that body of teaching, so there is no agreement or disagreement with us. You see the difference? What has taken place? *This is intelligence*. So there can never be any argument, disagreement, or agreement. And this is something marvellous if you really see this. So you have to help the student, who is already conditioned. My parents, the government, the public, they are all ready to defend all that. Now look at your brain, look at it. Has it put away all the rubbish of opinions?—out! So your brain is extraordinarily pliable, quick, to learn. Can you teach this to the student?

Rishi Valley, 9 December 1982

3

On Being Totally Free of Ideals

This place is not only a school but a centre of a religious people—What is a religious mind?—It has no belief no ideal, no concept towards which it is working—No sense of becoming something, of having a future—Need for a group of people who are totally free of ideals—Putting aside the concept of non-violence—How will you study the violence in you?—Being free of ideals and beliefs—Your immovable state and what it does to the students.

Krishnamurti (K): We were saying the other day that Rishi Valley is not just a school; probably in India it is considered a school, but I think we ought to regard it not merely as a school but as a place that is spiritual. I don't like the word *spiritual*.

GN: You said a spiritual and religious centre.

K: If you use the word *religious* or *spiritual*, it becomes one of those...

GN: *Religious* is slightly better than *spiritual*.

K: Yes.

GN: Because spiritual means occult.

K: So what word would you use—*religious*, *spiritual*? A gathering of people who are religiously minded, but without the religion of tradition and orthodoxy and centralized authority. So what is a religious life? The present religions throughout the world are just words, a great deal of belief and faith and years of propaganda. Would you consider all that religion? Idol worship, symbol worship, and the repetitive rituals day after day, all that surely is not religion. So what would you consider a religious life? Not joining an *ashrama* or following a guru; all that smells too much. So what would you call a religious group, a religious life? I think that is what we should have. At least I would like to suggest that this place is not only a school but a centre of a religious people. Not all that religion, but a different quality and so on. Now, what would you consider a religious man, a religious life?

AK: It is a life of inquiry into the nature of things.

K: There are scientists too who are doing that, investigating into matter.

AK: I am not talking of that.

K: So investigating into what?

AK: Into man's psychological nature.

PNS: Psychiatrists do this.

K: So what is a religious centre? What is a religious man? I think Rishi Valley should be both a school and that. What would you consider a religious mind?

PNS: A very intelligent, whole, holistic mind.

K: Yes. So what do you mean by *holistic mind*? What is a holistic mind?

PNS: One which can see things completely.

K: No, no. Is it just a theory, is it just an ideal towards which you are working? Then you are just like the other gang. So what would you consider a religious mind?

Q1: A mind which is able to see its own state in relation to what is happening outside and feels responsible for the condition outside and its impact on itself.

K: Lots of socialists do this. Lots of those who want to change the environment, society, feel that it must start near to go far. But let's move, sir.

RS: A mind which sees the importance of not asking for anything, but is perhaps unable to do this at the moment.

K: What do you mean 'ask'?

RS: You know, for oneself.

K: Just a minute, sir, be careful. Ask something for oneself—at what level?

GN: He feels he is not asking for anything, but sees the importance of something which he can't articulate. Are you saying that?

RS: Everywhere in the world we see that people want to do various things and that all these processes lead to division and chaos. So perhaps a religious mind is one that sees the importance of not asking anything for itself.

K: What would a religious mind demand the most? What is most important, essential, for a religious mind? Please, we are putting a lot of words together, but we will come to the point presently.

HP: Probably it is compassion.

K: Compassion. Now, have *you* compassion? Or is it just an idea, an ideal? Is it just a concept towards which you are working? Then you belong to the rest of them, right? You are all saying the same thing—that gradually we will work towards that. So would you consider a religious mind an idealistic mind? See the implications of it. An ideal, a utopian concept, a formula towards which you are working—would that be a religious mind? The ideal which we are going to achieve, a purpose, a goal towards which we are walking—would you call that a religious mind? I wouldn't. Would you? I wouldn't call it a religious mind. So we can eliminate one thing. Through negation, through elimination, we come to it. Do we agree to that?

AP: That is a very good way to start because all that has been said up to now is covered in that one.

K: Yes.

AP: If we negate each of these things that arise in the mind...

K: ...then we find out what it is. Would you agree?

RS: Yes.

AP: That is in relation to what he said: compassion. We know that we would like to feel compassion, and we know we haven't got it. We may have sympathy, but we don't have compassion. So it becomes again an aspiration.

K: Would you say then that a religious mind has no ideal?

SF: Krishnaji, how could we even say something like that other than as an idea?

K: When put into words, verbally, it may be translated as an idea, but not to have ideals. I have no ideals, personally I have no ideals, concepts put together by thought. 'To be a religious man I must be this'—which is a concept, which is a pattern, which is an ideal, which is the result of careful examination, analysis, and then coming to a conclusion and saying, 'This is it; if you are not that, you are not religious.'

SF: My question really is: we could also make an ideal of not having any ideal.

K: Of course.

SF: And so when we negate them, how do we negate them? Do we negate them just as an idea, or do we actually see the validity of it?

K: Yes, yes, of course.

SF: So if someone says a religious mind is one that has compassion or one that has humility...

K: No, I don't say anything. I negate what is not.

SF: And you make no positive statement?

K: No. Not positive. I say, after this little bit of discussion, that a religious mind has no ideals, no concepts towards which it is working.

HP: In our daily life we want our students...

K: I am not talking of students. I don't know what a religious life is, I don't know what a religious mind is. After finding out what a religious mind is, I will translate it to the student, but I am not concerned with the student for the moment. Would you say that a religious mind has no belief, no ideal, no movement towards a concept? What do you all say? Don't agree with me.

HP: But this is true if one is doing nothing, just sitting at home.

K: No, no. I am doing a great deal, I am not doing nothing. I am inquiring: What is a religious life, what is the quality of the mind which is religious, not in relation to the school or in relation to some other existing environmental demands, but what is a religious mind? Has the saint a religious mind? Has the pope a religious mind? Or Shankara or all the leaders of this present world of religious organizations—have they religious minds? I am inquiring, I am not saying they haven't. So are you free of belief?

PNS: Even disbelief?

K: Belief, not disbelief.

PNS: To say 'I don't believe' is also a position.

K: Ah, no. If you don't like the word *belief—faith*. Faith, belief, the whole of it—you understand? A religious mind has no ideals. That is a tremendous assertion. Which means there is no becoming something. Would you agree to that?

AK: If I say that, probably it becomes a verbal assertion because I don't know whether I have it.

K: Just see first what the implications are. I don't know mathematics or history, and you teach me. I listen to you and then say, 'Sir, this may be right, this may be wrong.' We question it, right? We are in that state. We are questioning the whole religious activity that goes on in the world—the Christian, the Buddhist, the

Muslim, the Hindu, the Chinese—the whole religious demand of man. Now we are asking, what is a religious mind? Does it live in concepts? Does it have ideals? Does it have faith in God, in Jesus, in the Buddha, or in some external entity to whom it prays, from whom it wants help, whom it looks up to, and all that kind of thing? That is what is generally understood to be a religious life. So would you, to find out what a religious life is, put aside all that? Can you?

PNS: Very simple.

K: Will you do it?

PNS: We have done it, sir.

K: Now, if you have done it, that means you have no sense of becoming something. I don't 'become' more noble, so I have no measurement. You see, it is a little more difficult than this. I am not 'better': there is no measurement as 'better', 'less', 'more', and so on.

SF: When there is a sense of self, is there always a sense of becoming?

K: I don't want to come to the self yet. We are approaching it differently. Leave the self alone. The moment you stop measuring, see what happens.

AP: Can we put it like this? Each one of us consciously or unconsciously lives in the framework of an environment, and there is interaction all the time, and this interaction is the becoming process.

K: That is only a part. Becoming implies time, measure, a future world. Is one free of all that? When you say 'no ideal', all that is implied. It's much more difficult than saying, 'Yes, I have no ideals', in the sense of a bigger nation, a wider nation, etc. It's the whole feeling of not having—I am using words carefully—a future.

RT: When he said that he has already done it, isn't it in a sense becoming?

K: I can't interpret him, he will tell you.

PNS: I meant all these religions.

K: All that kind of stuff.

PNS: They are simple things to...

K: Of course. They are all childish. But go much deeper than that, which is: not having an ideal implies that there is no measurement as from *what is* to *what should be*. Therefore you are then dealing only with *what is*. If there is no ideal,

then you are dealing only with what is actually going on. Would you accept this? That's why I am asking: has a religious mind an ideal, a sense of becoming, a sense of having a measurement?—'I'm this, in a year's time I'll be different.' Biologically, physically, we are changing all the time; we are not talking of that. Psychologically, there is no measurement. One must be very careful, otherwise one gets depressed if there is no future. The ideal is the future. If there is no ideal there is no tomorrow; therefore I am stuck. If I can use the word *hope*, I have no hope. I wonder if you see this?

HP: Sir, you are discarding effort completely.

K: No. Do I see this and do not make an effort to put aside ideals? I see they are meaningless.

GN: You say, 'I am not interested in becoming' or 'I am denying becoming.'

K: No, I'm not denying. We are questioning, we are not stating...

GN: ...what a religious mind is.

K: Yes. I say a religious mind has no ideal.

GN: You also said that there is no becoming.

K: Ideal is the becoming.

GN: Yes. Then there is the danger that I fall into 'being': 'I am not becoming, but I am in a state of being.' What would you say to that?

K: No.

PNS: I am what I am.

K: Just a minute. He says, 'If I am not becoming, I am.' Sir, according to the Jewish tradition—I have been told this—only Jehovah, the Nameless One, can say 'I am'. You understand the implications of that?

GN: That's what I mean: I can't say that.

K: See the implications of it: the Jewish tradition says that no human being can say, 'I am', only Jehovah can. I may be misrepresenting this.

GN: Yes, I have heard this.

K: So 'I am' means non-movement.

GN: But there is always some movement in the mind.

K: No, you are missing my point. I am not saying what you can say or I can say. We are asking, what is a religious mind? A religious mind—from this discussion—has no ideal, no sense of 'I am this, I'll become that', 'I am greedy but give me a year's time, I'll be out of it', which is measure, time, and so on. Would you say a religious mind is free of all this? Not time—that is too difficult, we won't go into it—but measurement, becoming, ideals.

Q1: Comparison.

K: Measurement is comparison. Go on, what do you say to that?

HP: All these come from thinking.

K: This comes from thinking, obviously. We are thinking together to find out, first by using words, which is a way of communication; and words are the expression of thought so that we can communicate with each other. We say a religious mind is not all that. That's all, only one step. Right?

PNS: Can one really be in a state of seeing without any movement?

K: We'll come to it, old boy; don't ask future questions before you have understood this.

PNS: I have understood what you say.

K: No, but inwardly. If there is to be a religious mind, this cannot exist. The negation of that which is false is the truth. The whole idealistic existence for me is nonsensical. Since Aristotle, that is since the 5th century B.C., the whole world has been based on ideals, and you and I who are nobodies get up and say it is nonsense. Either it is absolutely, irrevocably true, or we are just playing around.

PNS: We have to be very sceptical about what we think.

K: Yes. And sceptical about our denial. Or sceptical about the experience which we have had and to which we hold on. Now I must come back: a religious mind is free from all ideals. Would you agree? Are we thinking together in this? All those students have ideals, all their parents have ideals. The ideal of Mr Reagan, of Mrs Thatcher, the ideals of this country. Sir, you understand what we are up against? Either we are right, totally right, or they are totally right; you can't have a middle way.

PNS: All religions have ideals.

K: That's what I am saying. Either they are utterly nonsensical, false, illusory, or they are right and we are wrong. You can't...

PNS: ...have both.

K: Can't. So ideals are the projections of thought, an escape from *what is*. The word *idea* means in Greek 'to observe, to see', not what we have made out of it. So are we free of ideals? If we want to have a religious centre—'religious' in quotes—in Rishi Valley, there must be a group of people who are totally free of ideals.

HP: Does that not become an ideal—our wanting it?

K: No, of course not, of course not. You see how you have said that?

HP: It has to happen.

K: Not 'to happen'. You see the absurdity of having ideals; then you can't make *that* into an ideal.

PNS: Then we can keep on playing.

K: Of course, of course. Now, are we together in this? The ten of us, fifteen of us, twenty of us, are we together in this?

Q3: It is very difficult to understand this because when one normally uses the word *religious*, it means something other than what you see.

K: I don't mean that.

Q3: What I am trying to say is that if you discard ideals altogether, you discard a path to something, you discard all goals.

K: Of course, of course. A path towards a goal, an end, a purpose, all that is implied in the word *ideal*.

Q3: It is very difficult to see that.

K: To see what?

Q3: To see that you don't have a specific path.

K: Of course, of course. A path, a system, a method leading you from this to that—we are denying *that*. What's the difficulty in this? I know it is a very complex thing. If you deny *what should be*, which is the future, then how do you face *what is*? Violence has no future, you understand? In India, especially after

years of propaganda for non-violence, we are all caught in the ideal of non-violence. It seems so absurd: when I am violent, pretending not to be violent or saying ‘I’m practising non-violence’ or ‘I’m doing my best to become non-violent’, which is all idiotic nonsense. You may agree with me, but the whole of India believes in this. So we are asking, what is a religious mind? I am sticking to that and saying an idealistic mind is not a religious mind. That is what I say, I may be wrong. Correct me, for God’s sake, correct me, work at it, tell me I am totally wrong. We will discuss it.

HP: I completely agree with you, but my question is: can one live twenty-four hours a day without ideals?

K: You are going to find out, sir. You are going to find out how to live twenty-four hours, or a hundred hours, without ideals. Why do we want ideals?

RT: What you are saying is: don’t have an ideal, a goal, or a path, but live from moment to moment.

K: Don’t state that yet, don’t say ‘from moment to moment’.

RT: Otherwise you have a goal towards something.

K: Yes, yes, look at it. I am violent; if I have no ideal of non-violence, I have only that. I have only the feeling of violence, not that I must change violence into non-violence, which is the ideal, but only that I am violent. Right, sir?

PNS: But what is the quality of mind which sees that it is violent? You may see it, but there is the murderer who wants to be violent.

K: I am not talking of that man.

PNS: He doesn’t want to be non-violent; he wants to stay with his violence.

K: No. What he wants is to express his violence. To kill somebody, to hurt somebody, to criticize somebody is violence. Now, are you like that?

PNS: I don’t know.

K: Are you? Do you want to express your violence? Beat me up?

PNS: No.

K: Hit somebody?

PNS: No.

K: Imitate somebody?

PNS: No.

K: Conform to something which you think is right?

PNS: No.

K: That is all part of violence. Begin with that, don't probe more. That is, begin with what we understand, right?

PNS: But these are very simple things which I can deal with.

K: That is all you have: violence. What is the difficulty in this? Generally we are violent, and we attempt to become non-violent.

PNS: That is very clear to me.

K: Very clear. Now, what is the action of a human being who is only violent, not non-violent? What does he do with that violence?

PNS: He doesn't act violently, but he just sees it.

K: Then what?

PNS: I don't know because I have stopped there many times.

GN: The violent man expresses his violence in some way or the other, but what Krishnaji is implying is something very different. You see, there is the violent man who wants to express his violence. Then there is the violent man who has an ideal of non-violence and pretends to be non-violent, but he is violent all the time and never sees violence as a reality in himself. Then there is the third possibility of seeing violence in yourself and not escaping to an ideal.

PNS: That is an ideal to me.

GN: You can start seeing it intellectually just as you classify various axioms in mathematics. The third possibility is that you see something and do not escape into its opposite. Sometimes the scientific attitude requires it. If you are observing something through the microscope, you can't escape into previous knowledge or something else. That is an attitude of study. So when you study something, you are looking at it without projecting its opposite.

K: Sir, are you studying violence, in yourself? Study it, not say, 'I must not be, I am.' You are learning. Are you learning about your violence? Learning?

PNS: I obviously don't know what I do about all this, but I am stuck all the time.

K: Be simple, be really simple. You are violent, obviously every human being is. Do you want to learn the content of it?

PNS: I surely want to learn.

K: Which means what? When you want to learn something, what is implied in that?

PNS: Lot of care.

K: You are all so blasted clever. What's the matter with all of you? I don't know mathematics, I am learning from you. Which means what? I know nothing about it.

PNS: We start from scratch.

K: Yes. From scratch. I know nothing about it, and you are going to teach me. Which means I am curious, I want to know, I listen. Now, I want to learn about violence, and I cannot learn about violence if I have the concept of non-violence. So you must put that aside, will you? The concept, the ideal that I must not be violent—put all that aside, can you? And then learn about violence. And you cannot learn about violence if you have all this chatter around your mind. So simple. Will you do it? Are you doing it? Violence implies wanting to hurt somebody, violence implies getting angry, violence implies imitation, conformity, the sense of righteous indignation. So I am learning about violence. Instead of becoming non-violent, I am learning about it. It opens the door a tremendous lot. So we are saying a religious mind is a non-violent mind because it has studied violence—in itself, not somebody else's violence. I have studied my violence. I am violent because I want to hurt somebody, I am angry, I am jealous, I am furious about something or the other. I am learning. It may be endless learning because violence has got such varieties of expression. So I learn about it, but I am not becoming something. It isn't that I have learnt about anger, I have read the book of anger and come to the end of the book. I am learning, right? Would you then say that a religious mind is always learning, never coming to a conclusion? What do you say to that?

Q1: Do you mean to say that it is living in the present?

K: You don't know what it means. How can you live in the present if you don't understand the past? What is the present, sir?

Q1: The past. The present is the past in a different form.

K: What is the present? Tell me what the present is. The second, by the watch?

Q1: No.

K: Then what do you mean by the present?

Q1: It is *what is*, inwardly *what is*.

K: So are you separating the present from the past?

Q1: No.

K: So the past is the present, modified, slightly altered. No, sir. That is why if you say we must live in the present, I don't know what that means.

AP: When you take a problem like anger, it is actually like this: anger may be triggered by an immediate contact now, but actually the whole mind has this anger in a suspended condition, and an incident merely...

K: ...triggers that off.

AP: So we have to probe deeper for this violence.

K: Look, I want to find out what is a religious mind. It may be intellectual at first, or it may not be. I want to find out. So I am saying all this is not; I am pushing out everything that is not. I say an idealistic mind is not a religious mind. My God, do you realize what we are saying? It means we are totally against the whole world of ideation. I don't know if you realize all this. So a religious mind has no ideals; it doesn't function with concepts, with anything other than *what is*.

RS: Krishnaji, you mentioned just now that imitation is also violence, and this has very strange implications because all ideals probably arise from the desire to imitate. Which means, having ideals is violence. So we see that the very idea of non-violence as it is practised is violence.

K: Of course it is.

RS: But since children in the learning process are always imitating, where is the violence in this imitation?

K: Forget the children. You! We are talking about you. I am not connected with the schools, you are not connected with the schools. You are not teachers; you are human beings first and teachers afterwards. If we want to establish a 'religion'—in quotes—or inquire into what is a religious mind, we are saying a religious mind is this.

RS: Would you explain how imitation is actually violence?

K: All right. Why do I imitate, imitation being that I have an example, I copy that example? Which means what? I conform to that image, to that principle, to that concept; I imitate that. What are the implications of imitation?

RH: I am condemning *what is*.

K: That's it. I am condemning *what is*, what I am. Which is violence, right?

RS: Not only that. I think imitation implies ambition, which is a form of violence, isn't it?

K: Of course. We said that earlier. So are we clear on this? Are we all of the same mind? For God's sake, come to the point. Are we all of the same mind? Do we all see the same thing together—that ideals have no place in a mind that is 'in religion' (in quotes) or in a mind that is tremendously watchful?

RS: Can I raise another question? Doesn't this imply that in a place like this there is no pattern of behaviour which is implicit?

K: Yes, all right. There is no pattern.

RS: There is no pattern of behaviour.

K: No.

RS: I feel that all of us must concur in this.

K: That is what I'm trying to say. Are we all together in this? What do you say? This is our homework, right? [*Laughs*]

Q1: If violence is the end-product of all my thoughts, then do you think I can just negate it?

K: End-product—what do you mean by that? Or would you put it as 'Violence has always been with me'?

Q1: Yes.

K: I have inherited it from the animal, and so violence has always been with me. Violence is part of my existence, that's all I know. I don't know anything about non-violence. As long as I exist, part of my life is violence. And a violent mind cannot be a religious mind; that's all I am saying. So is it possible for me to be totally free from violence, though I have inherited it, though that has been my life, that has been my past, though my breeding, everything is violent? Can I be free of that? Not as an ideal. Is it possible to be free of something that I have inherited, that's a part of me, part of my nose, part of my face, part of my life?

Somebody comes along and says you can; he says that unless you are free from it, you cannot be a religious man. And religion is important because that is the only factor that brings about a new culture. And he says that if you want to live the present existence, which is based on violence, there must be freedom from violence. You might say: 'Help me to be free from it' or 'Show me, let's talk about it, let's have communication, a discussion, a dialogue about whether man can ever be free from violence; let's have a dialogue, not only intellectually but factually.'

PNS: But if I don't know, how can I have a dialogue? I don't know.

K: What don't you know?

PNS: It is not like a classroom dialogue.

K: Don't you know what violence is? Of course.

PNS: I know what violence is.

K: That's all. Let's talk about it.

PNS: I can talk only about how I am violent, why I am.

K: No, no. Let's go into it. Read this. It is a book, isn't it?

PNS: Yes.

K: Let's read the chapters, the pages.

PNS: It can't be read now, it has to be read every day.

K: You are going through it now. The moment you admit time...

PNS: I am not admitting time.

K: You *are*, by asking 'Can I?' It's life, you have to discuss it.

PNS: I am not admitting time, I am not saying I will do it tomorrow.

K: So can you read that book?

PNS: Now?

K: Yes.

PNS: At this moment?

K: Yes.

PNS: At this moment?

K: Yes, sir.

PNS: At this moment I am a very harmless man. [*Laughter*]

K: That's just it, that's just it. Pick up all the threads of violence and look at it.

PNS: Maybe there is a chance of making it very conceptual.

K: Not conceptual.

AP: That which is in the subconscious must come up in the conscious, shouldn't it? It is there; I may be very harmless just now, but it is all there, simmering inside me. At the right moment it comes out, so I can't say there is no violence in me at this moment.

PNS: It's all...

K: ...theory? No, sir. How will you study violence?

PNS: Surely I will not study it like I study geography or history.

K: So how will you study it? Go on, move. How will you study it? You're going to find out, you're going to learn how to study it. Going to learn—which means what? How do you learn? What is the first thing? You want that boy to learn geography; what is the first thing you want him to do?

PNS: Attention.

K: Which means what? Listening to what you're going to say.

PNS: Yes.

K: Listening to what you want to tell him, right? Here listen to what your violence is telling you.

Q1: That is what I am saying: we must be in contact with violence.

K: Yes, look.

AK: I can observe it only when it is expressed.

K: No, sir. I understand your difficulty. But first look at this. Are you going to learn page by page what violence is, read page by page all the history of violence not only in the world but also in you?

AP: Within oneself.

K: Yes, within you. How will you study the violence which is in you? Go on, apply. First you look, don't you? How do you look? What do you mean by looking? Tell me how you look. How do you look at violence, which is a part of you? How do you look at your face when you are shaving? In the mirror, don't you?

PNS: Yes.

K: What's the difficulty?

PNS: I just look.

K: Where? Just in the air?

PNS: In the mirror.

K: In a mirror. So what is the mirror in which you can look to discover the whole movement of violence? What is the mirror?

PNS: Relationship?

K: No! Don't answer quickly. What is the mirror in which you can look at the whole movement of anger, of violence? Is there a mirror in which you can look at the whole movement of violence? You can see your face, can't you, in a mirror. So is there a mirror in which you can see the whole of this? Find out, don't say you don't know. The mirror has been invented, and you can see your face when you shave or comb or when you say 'How nice I look.' And is there such a mirror in which you can see the whole movement of violence? There must be, mustn't there? Let's find out.

PNS: Let's find out.

K: I'm doing it, not you.

PNS: I'm doing it.

K: Now, do it with me.

RD: Till now you have been my mirror which has shown me what violence is. The question is: is there a mirror in itself, as it were?

K: Throw me out.

RD: No, no. You have been a mirror: I wouldn't have understood a bit about violence if I had not been with you, heard you, and watched with you.

K: Yes.

RD: Now what I am saying is: as far as I am concerned you have been the mirror.

K: Right. Now, is there a mirror which will show you the whole movement of violence? As much as you see in a mirror the whole of your face, can you see the whole of this movement?

RD: What do you mean by 'the whole of the movement'?

K: You can see in the mirror your whole face, can't you? You can turn that way, you can turn this way, or you can see the whole thing if it is a large mirror. Now, is there such a mirror in which you can see the whole of violence? Or there may not be. So I am asking, is there a mirror? Now I put that question to you; what's your answer?

PNS: We stop thinking.

K: No. What's your answer?

PNS: I will find out.

K: That's it. How will you find out?

RD: My own looking is the mirror, but it is not a clear mirror: it shows a distorted image.

K: Then why isn't it clear?

RD: I'm watching.

K: You are all so complicated. God, what minds you have! Repeating the same thing.

GN: In fact I thought he said it: the mirror is relationship.

K: He said it, I know. I want him to find out. Was that just a repetition or...?

PNS: No, sir, no.

K: Wait. I was going to bring it out later. If you say the whole of violence can be seen in my relationship with another, then relationship is the mirror.

PNS: Sitting alone in a room I can't see my violence.

K: So in relationship you can see the whole movement of violence. Can you? Or is it just an idea that in relationship this exists? You understand what I am saying? You are all getting tired. Poor chaps, you are not used to all this. [*Laughs*] Sir, you said just now that in relationship you can see the whole movement of violence. Why did you say that?

PNS: In dealing with some people I saw how I had thought I was not a violent man, but often I expressed my violence very subtly.

K: So you realize that in relationship you can see these things.

PNS: In a way.

K: In a way. Now, can you see the whole of it, not little by little, little by little, day after day? When you say 'little', you have already measured it.

PNS: Yes, I have measured it, right now.

K: So catch yourself. I see how important relationship is. In that relationship I see my reactions, my responses, my ugliness, my this and my that. Now, that mirror of relationship is as actual as the mirror hanging on the wall. In that mirror I see myself being violent—only a part of it because I have shown violence at that moment. Now I am asking a question: can I see the whole of it? If you can see a part of it, as you said you can, why don't you see the whole of it? What is preventing you? Ask what's preventing you, inquire. If I can see a part, why don't I see the whole?

PNS: Maybe I have not seen clearly.

K: You see, you are ready with an answer. If I can see one part of it, why don't I see all of it?

PNS: You don't look at it completely.

K: Ah, no. Don't say these things. When you are looking at that part, don't you also want to see the whole of it? Or are you concentrated only on that part?

PNS: I want to see the whole.

K: No, you are missing my point. If you are fixed on one part, you can't see the rest. So if you see one part, you move. I wonder if I am making myself clear?

RH: It's an unfocussed looking.

K: Yes. Right? So there is a mirror, apart from the physical mirror, in which you can see the whole movement of violence—if you are quick. That's it. But if you are slow you say: 'Yes, I see one part, why don't I see the other part? What's wrong with me? I must cultivate observation.' Get it? Which means, to observe the whole movement of violence, you must be as quick as the movement. That means your brain must be so *extraordinarily* alert to watch the whole of it. Look at the whole tree, not just a few branches, but the whole tree, see how beautiful it is. Have you seen one of those trees? How extraordinary it is when you see the whole of it. And you don't have to study it leaf by leaf; it is there.

Now, would you say a religious mind is a mind that sees the whole and not the part only? If you see the whole movement of religious organizations—I'm taking that—if you see the whole of it, you are out of it; you don't join something else or create something else. Now, are you out of that, completely out of the whole religious, the so-called religious, organized propaganda with its faith, belief, doctrine, ritual? Wipe it out. It's gone, right? That is one.

Then ideals; it's much more difficult. You don't think in terms of measurement, of the better: 'I'm better than I was yesterday'—an awful thing to say. Are you out of that? So you have no measurement whatsoever, which means no comparison, no comparing of yourself with somebody and saying, 'My God, how good he is, I would like to be like that', and all that business. So if you deny this religious movement as it is established in the world, if you are free of ideals, what's happening to you? What's happening to the brain, to the mind, that is free of this? What's happening to it when you are free of these two, just these two? Begin with these two: ideals, and the beliefs, the rituals, and all the extraordinary things that are going on in the name of so-called religion.

PNS: You have to negate all these.

K: You have negated it. Tell me, what's happened to you?

PNS: You are free.

K: Yes, all right. Then what? What's the state of your mind—we'll call it 'mind' for the moment—what's the state of your being when you say, 'Finished with this, out'?

PNS: It has strength.

K: Unless you are clear, don't say anything. You see what it means?

PNS: To have integrity.

K: Which means what? You have a tremendous, immovable quality about these two. You have such an immovable state because you have realized that these two

are absurd. Therefore you have got tremendous integrity, and therefore it is like a rock in the middle of an ocean.

Now we come back: you meet these students; what is their relationship to you? You are immovable, you understand? Religion, ideals are absolutely out, therefore you are like a rock. What's their position to you? What is their relationship? How do they treat you? Don't you know? Put yourself in those boys, sir.

PNS: Very affectionate.

K: No. Don't use those words. They have always met human beings...

PNS: ...with all this.

K: ...with all this, and therefore there is nobody they meet who is immovable. What happens? You are always meeting people who are moving, changing, having ideals and trying, and I come up against you who says, 'This is so.' Look at the boy: what does he feel towards you? He has always met people who wobble from one thing, move from one thing to the other; or obstinate people. You are not obstinate. So what happens? What happens when I meet somebody who says, 'This is so'? After all the arguments, everything, he says, 'This is so.' And I say, 'My God, I have never met a human being like that before.' You are communicating something which I have never met before.

PNS: Like my relationship with you.

K: Ah, ah. [*Laughs*] I know. Cut me out. I purposely avoid that.

PNS: Why do you purposely avoid it, sir?

K: I am gone, day after tomorrow. Dead.

PNS: Yes.

K: Yes, sir! So I meet somebody who is like clear water without any reflection. Solid! You know what it does to another? Are you in that position when you meet these boys? Immovable! So we are going to find out.

A religious mind is free from the so-called organized religions of the world which are put together by thought. And it has no ideals of any kind. Which means it is concerned only with facts, with *what is* and the transformation—not transformation—the ending of *what is*. Not an ideal, but ending. I am violent; I am concerned only with the ending of it, the whole movement of it, and the freedom from it. So what else is there for a religious mind?

PNS: Energy.

K: You have this energy. When you are not playing with false things, you have energy. What is the other thing? I would say no conflict—no conflict within oneself and therefore no conflict with anybody. Only then can there be love, can there be compassion and intelligence. The ending! Can you end conflict in yourself? When you talk to the students about not having conflict, unless it is inside you, they become cynical and say, 'Yes, he is a hypocrite, no point in listening to this man.' We had better stop now.

* * *

GN: Sir, I wanted to ask you: I feel that this group should meet frequently, but there are other serious people who come here and who want to be a part of this.

K: Bring them.

GN: For instance, RR wanted to come here.

K: Why didn't you bring him?

GN: I told him that we are a group of teachers and so he should...

K: Please don't even ask me.

GN: So, as we continue these meetings, is it possible that we invite those people who are serious and who want to come? Or do we keep it open only for the teachers?

K: No, no, no.

AP: The difficulty is that many times problems crop up among ourselves, and I feel that if you want to discuss these things, you may find it embarrassing to have people from outside because then you can't talk freely.

K: Then don't talk about school matters.

AP: That's what I am saying: no school matters, no personal matters. This should be about the teachings, about what we are all here for.

K: I am saying, sir, we want to have a place in Rishi Valley which is not merely a school, but a place of something else. So if, as he says, there are people who are interested, let them come.

GN: I am raising this particularly because throughout the year we get people who are serious, and if we are meeting and communicating something to each of them, they also want to be a part of this. Sometimes it is a parent, a father, or a mother, sometimes a friend working in Tirupati or Madras.

K: I would take them in, I would bring them in.

RH: Can we make the criterion something like what he suggested—that those who feel that this thing is a part of their life should come?

K: Should come. Of course.

RD: But why should we be the judge of another person's seriousness in this matter?

K: Sir, we make it very clear that we are a serious people and say, 'If you are serious come in. If you aren't, please don't.' It's so simple, keep it simple.

Rishi Valley, 14 December 1982

4

The Cessation of Conflict

Find out if one can lead a life without a single conflict—Questioning the divisive process of agreement and disagreement—For a religious group to be, there must be no conflict—Images give a sense of identity, a sense of stability, a sense of isolation—I live on something dead and therefore my brain also dies—Seeing the divisive nature of images, which brings conflict—On love—Building together a religious centre—Cooperation not around a person, an ideal, but the spirit of cooperation.

Krishnamurti (K): Let's make it clear again: in Rajghat, Benares, a few of us formed a nucleus, that is, a group of people who are concerned entirely with the teachings, and we formed, if I can use the word, a *religious* group. And so we thought that at Rishi Valley too there should be such a group, a nucleus of people who are concerned with the world and so naturally with the teachings. We will use, for the moment, the word *teachings* for what K has been talking about. And Rishi Valley should become not only a first-class school but also a religious centre. We mean by *religion* not the so-called, orthodox, traditional, fanciful, romantic, nonsensical religions. And we were inquiring the other day into what is a religious mind. The etymological meaning of that word *religion* is not very clear; none of the dictionaries has made the root meaning clear. But we can, more or less, by negating what is not the religious mind, come to discover for ourselves what is a mind that is truly religious.

We said a mind that thinks in terms of ideals is not a religious mind—ideal in the sense of a projection of what should be, what might be, what ought to be, the end, the goal, the purpose, the conceptual statement of something other than *what is*. We said that such a mind, which functions in ideas, in ideals, pursuing a certain direction laid down by thought, is not a religious mind. And also we said a religious mind is not a believing mind. It is rather sceptical, doubting, questioning, inquiring, and so there is no sense of authority, no sense of a hierarchical outlook on life. So there is no belief: 'I believe in some strange fanciful god', or 'I believe I shall be that', and so on. Also, we said—which is much more complex—a religious mind has no conflict; that is, it perceives the nature of conflict and eliminates conflict.

I think we reached that point, didn't we? Can we go further into this? We want Rishi Valley to be a religious centre, not merely a school, but a religious centre in the sense of having no beliefs, no ideals. Ideals are very, very complex business, and there must be the cessation of conflict in oneself and in one's relationship with others. This is what we came up to the last time we met here. Now, can we discuss this? Discuss it, not me talk and explain; let's go into it together to find out if one can lead a life without a single conflict, not only in oneself but in one's relationships, in one's communication, in one's activity. Not

only not create conflict but also understand the nature of conflict and end it—can we go into that?

HP: When the mind is watching the conflicts going on, would you call that a religious mind?

K: Now, let's understand what we mean by conflict. What do you mean by conflict? A struggle, a sense of *what is* and *what should be*, a sense of contradiction, a statement and the contradiction of that statement in oneself, saying one thing and doing another. I would for the moment call that conflict—saying one thing and doing another, in which there is a great deal of pretension, hypocrisy, lack of integrity and honesty. So what do you mean by conflict?

GN: There is a Western way of looking at this. There are two ideas with regard to conflict. One is reducing of tension. The other is that when a man takes up a big challenge, there can be an increasing of tension not necessarily of the nature of a conflict.

K: So let's find out what we mean by conflict.

GN: Yes, what is the relationship between conflict...

K: ...and challenge?

GN: ...and tension and challenge?

K: Yes. What is the state of one who is being challenged? I am challenging you now. Is that challenge awakening a defensive mechanism, which then would be a conflict or a resistance, which then breeds conflict? Or is it a challenge which you observe without reaction? Which is it?

Q1: If we observe the challenge, I don't think there is any conflict in observing.

K: But there is conflict when there is resistance.

Q1: No. Without any resistance you just observe.

K: That is quite a difficult matter. What do you mean by observing?

Q1: You don't come to any conclusion.

K: Yes.

Q1: You don't decide that what you are saying is not correct or what I am thinking is correct; you just listen.

K: Which means you are not reacting to the challenge.

Q1: No.

K: You are not resisting the challenge, you are not accepting it.

Q1: No.

K: Or denying it.

Q1: No.

K: Then what is your approach to the challenge? If you are not denying it, if you are not accepting it, if you are not resisting it, if you are not creating in the very observation of that conflict a resistance, if none of these exist, then what is your approach to the challenge?

Q2: Factual approach.

K: What do you mean by *factual approach*?

Q2: There is no resistance, no image; you simply face the challenge.

K: I am challenging you now. Sorry.

Q1: With what are you challenging us, sir?

K: I am challenging you to find out what you mean by conflict. That is a challenge. What do you mean by conflict? How does conflict arise?

Q2: Conflict is between an image and an actuality.

K: Yes. Which means what? I have a wife, and there is conflict between us, and between my brother and myself, between my father and myself, and so on. What do you mean by that conflict? What is my relationship with my wife, which brings about conflict?

Q3: Disagreement.

K: Why is there disagreement? Look, sir, here we are; why is there disagreement between us?

Q1: Because there is no relationship.

K: No, don’t reduce it to relationship. Why is there disagreement? Either it is a disagreement of opinion, disagreement of judgement, disagreement of

conclusions. Am I making all this clear, or am I using a lot of words? My wife and I disagree: she clings to an opinion, and I cling to mine; her values are different from mine, her evaluation of what is necessary is different from mine, and so on. Why is there disagreement?

PNS: Because I hold on to my opinion.

K: Go on. Why?

Q3: There is a division between my wife and me.

K: Yes, but you are not answering my question.

Q3: Probably I don't want to compromise.

K: Which means what? I compromise, which is a form of conflict. So compromise breeds conflict.

GN: He said, '*I don't* want to compromise.'

K: If you don't want to compromise, it means you have already compromised. [*Laughter*] I am not being clever, please.

Q4: There is no clarity in my vision, in either of our visions.

K: Is that it?

Q4: When I cannot see very clearly, I cling to what I see or what I want to see, and whoever it is I'm relating to clings to his or her opinions.

PNS: At times I may see very clearly, but I don't want to give myself up.

K: Let's talk about it. You have disagreements with people, don't you?

PNS: No, sir.

K: Oh, no. Don't say no.

Q3: What do you mean by disagreement?

K: He does something which I disapprove of.

Q3: It is quite possible we can't agree with all.

K: Ah, wait. This is how we have existed all our lives. I question this whole attitude of disagreement.

Q3: It is not an attitude of disagreement. In some cases you have to disagree. Why should you agree always?

K: I am coming to that. You are asserting that there must be disagreement.

Q3: Not necessarily, but there can be.

GN: Are you saying that there can be disagreement, but it is not conflict?

Q3: It can be resolved.

K: A disagreement can be dissolved, but why do I have disagreement?

Q3: Probably we have not understood each other.

K: Which means what? I stick to 'my wife and myself' because that is what most of us are caught in. My wife does something and I disagree with it, or I do something and she disagrees with it—there is conflict. I am questioning why between two people who have known each other, have had sex, children, all that, why there is disagreement at all. Don't answer it quickly, go into it a little bit.

PNS: There is no care, we don't care for each other.

K: So what does that mean? Explain it to me a little more. I don't understand what you mean by it.

PNS: You say something to me, and if I have to really understand you, I should care to listen to you and try to understand what you mean.

K: My wife doesn't care to listen to me, and I don't care to listen to her, because we have lived together for ten years or twenty years or fifty years, and we know each other's reactions very quickly, and we say, 'Oh God, here it begins again.' Is that all very familiar? [*Laughter*] Now, I am questioning this whole divisive process of agreement and disagreement. There is divisiveness in this.

PNS: Even in agreement?

K: Even in agreement. I question why there is divisiveness, why there is division, which brings about agreement or disagreement. In that there is conflict. Then there is compromise: 'Darling, you do what you want to do', and she says, 'Today I will', and all the rest of it. Now you tell me: why is there this divisive process in human relationship, which is really the essence of conflict?

Q2: Can we approach it through the attachment of each individual?

K: That arises later. I am attached to my wife. Why am I attached? I don't want to enter into that for the moment; it leads us somewhere else. Why is there division between my wife and myself, between myself and society, between myself and the community, myself and the nation, myself and God, and so on? Why is there this divisive, fragmentary process going on in one? Put your brain into it, sir.

Q5: Because I have an idea of how I think it should be.

K: Yes, we said that. There is a separative attitude towards life: I want my way and you want your way, or I think it should be that way, and she thinks it should not be that way. All those processes are divisive, fragmentary, breeding conflict. Now, I want to know why there is this division.

Q3: Is it dependence?

K: No, sir.

Q5: Is it selfishness?

K: What do you mean by that word *selfishness*? Please bear in mind what we are discussing: we want Rishi Valley to be not only a school but also a religious centre, which is far more important than the school. From the religious centre, schools can be something excellent, super-excellent. So we are trying to understand what is a religious mind. We said a religious mind doesn't have any rituals, puja, all the verbal statements, and so on. It doesn't belong to any group, any sect, any ideal, any utopia. We also said it has no beliefs, no ideals. And we said that for a religious group, for a religious mind to be, there must be no conflict. Conflict exists between me and you, husband and wife, etc. I ask, why does it exist? Not that I should compromise, I should tolerate, I should adjust. I don't want to adjust, I don't want to compromise. I want to understand why there is conflict between me and you.

AK: Each one carries an image of himself and of others, and conflict arises because of these images.

K: Why do you have images?

AK: From the past, from experience.

K: Don't just throw a lot of words; go into it a little bit. Why do you have an image about yourself? Why? The wife has an image about her husband. Both the wife and the husband have an image about each other. Why?

PNS: To have some form of security, to be mechanical.

K: Be clear, don't be hesitant, think it out. All right, let's begin the other way. Forget the wife. Why do I have an image about myself? You all have it, haven't you? Agreed? Why?

Q1: The image is based on some feeling, pleasurable or painful.

K: Feeling, yes. But why do I have it?

PNS: There is some form of insecurity, so I want to have something to be sure of.

K: So are you saying that having an image about myself gives me a certain sense of security?

PNS: Yes.

K: Are you doubtful?

PNS: No, I am sure.

K: You are sure. He and I agree.

PNS: Agree?

K: No, we see the same fact. You and I see the same fact, as you and I see that this is a microphone. We have called it a microphone. You can call it a giraffe, but then we would both call it a giraffe; there would be no sense of agreement and disagreement. So do we both see—you and I for the moment—that having an image about oneself gives a sense of security? Do we, all of us, see this fact? Do we see the same fact as we see the same red flower on that tree? So there is no agreement or disagreement about the creation of an image which gives us security. We see the same fact, therefore there is no agreement or disagreement. Are we clear in this?

Q1: Could we go into that a little more, sir?

K: Why do I have an image about myself? From childhood this image has been built up—my father and my mother say, 'You must be like somebody else', 'You are not as good as your brother', 'You are not as beautiful as...' You know what they do. It's not only what the parents do, but also you create your own image, don't you? And that gives you a sense of identity, a sense of having roots somewhere, a sense of stability. Agreed? Not agree, do you see it?

Q1: That's one part of it.

K: Good enough, begin with that. So this building up of an image from childhood is me. Take away that image, what have I?

GN: Is this sense of location necessary? Like a point, it must have a location.

K: I may have an image about the whole of India, an image as an Indian, as a communist, but we all have some kind of image.

GN: What I am asking is: this point of location, this point of security, is it a human necessity?

K: We're going to find out. But do we all see that we have images? It is so obvious: we all have them. If you inquire into why we have them, then you begin to find out, as you have found out for yourself, that it gives us a sense of identity, a sense of being, a sense of isolation. In that isolation there is security and so on. Do we all see this point before we go further? Do you see it? Can we go on from there? Now, why do I have it? And why has it become so extraordinarily important? And what is the nature and structure of this image? I know the nature and structure of a microphone; it has been very carefully put together by thought, by experience, by knowledge. And this image which I have built about myself—what is the nature of it, what is the structure of it?

PNS: What do you mean by *structure*?

K: This building is a structure, it has been put together. The meaning of that word *structure* is movement. This is a movement.

PNS: It is not a movement, it is static.

K: Leave it at that, I won't go into it. Now, what is the nature of this image? How has it been put together, which is the structure? It is a movement—adding, adding, taking away, adding. I'm asking you, 'What is the nature of it? What is the content of it?'

PNS: All that has happened.

Q1: The accumulation of all past experiences, whether they are pleasurable or painful.

K: Go on. I don't want to tell you.

Q4: It is also built on all the ideals that I have held.

K: Yes.

Q3: What has been told to you.

K: Yes. Your experiences, your concepts. Put it all together, you will see it in a minute. Your beliefs, your concepts, your judgements, your hurts, your desires, and so on and so on. The nature of the image is—what?

Q3: An accumulation of all this?

K: Yes. Move a little more; we have said ‘all that’.

Q2: Memory, sir.

K: He said memory. Right? Is the nature and structure of the image memory?

Q4: And thought, which is based on memory.

K: Memory, right? The whole thing is based on memory. No?

RH: Then you will have to say ‘a certain kind of memory’, because you can have factual memories.

K: For the moment we are saying it is all based on memory.

Q1: Remembrance.

K: Remembrance, which is memory. Remembrance of things past, right? So what is it? If the nature of the image is memory, then what is it? What is memory?

PNS: Past.

K: What does that mean?

Q4: It is not actual.

K: Yes, it’s something gone. My brother is dead, but I have a memory of him. Which means what? Come on, what is the matter with all of you? My brother is dead, I have a memory of him. What does that mean? That is also dead. So what does it mean? I am living on dead things, right? The nature of my image is memory, remembrance of things that have happened, and so on and so on. On that I am living, and she is living on that, and you are living on that.

PNS: So we are not really living.

K: What does it mean? Come on, sirs, look at it.

AP: We are afraid to be completely new, which means to be totally uncertain about ourselves, about others.

K: Answer my question, sir, if you don't mind. I am living in the past, which is the accumulation of memory of a hundred years or fifty years or ten years, and she is living on that too. And I am asking, what is the quality, the nature of it?

RH: Shadow boxing.

K: Shadow boxing! [*Laughter*] Yes. Go on, tell me some more. See, you are not *with* it. It is still ideas, right? You are not with the image which you have, and you are not watching that image and seeing the nature of that image. It is something that is over, a remembrance, which is memory. And memory is what?—words, pictures, symbols, all dead things. I can give them vitality, but they are dead.

PNS: It is like a machine going on.

K: No. Machines have vitality.

PNS: Memory also has.

K: I said I have a dead brother and I remember him, but the fact is that he is gone. And I have certain recollections, remembrances, which are all my memory; on that I am living. What does that mean?

Q2: It means I am dead to the present.

K: I don't know what the present is. That is one of the most difficult things: to find out what the present is.

PNS: I am being pulled, influenced by memory.

K: You *are* that image. I don't think you realize this: you are not being pulled by the image; you *are* the image!

PNS: Yes, sir. One must be careful with words.

K: Exactly. You stick to one example and work it out. My brother is dead, fifty or sixty years ago. If I am living on the memory of that brother, then what is that memory, what is the quality of that memory?

HP: That quality will depend on whether you are forcing yourself to have that memory or whether it is spontaneous.

K: No, there is no spontaneity in memory. Please just listen. My brother is dead, which is a fact, and if I am living on the memory of his life, how we walked together, what we said together, the shirts we wore, and so on and so on, what is my brain doing?

Q1: It is in the past.

K: Yes, what does that mean? I am living in the past, right? Now, what does that mean—living in the past? On what? What is the past?

PNS: I am living on ideas.

K: I am living on ideas, what does that mean?

PNS: Things that are not real.

K: Stick to that. I am living on something that is not real, that is not actual. Which is my image. What does that mean? Why am I doing this?

HP: But this act of memory which is happening in the present is actual, isn't it?

K: Is it? It is actual in the sense I am bringing something dead to be actual. What's the matter with all of you? What's the difficulty in this? Somebody help me, please. Look, I will go into it. My brother is dead—fifty-seven years ago.

PNS: You remember it very well.

K: I just calculated now. He died in '25, fifty-seven years ago. And I have a picture of him, how he looked, lived, what we talked about. (I haven't got it, so don't go into that for the moment.) He died of tuberculosis, and I remember all the things he said to me, what I said to him, the quarrels, etc. So I am living on something that is gone, on something that is only remembered. That remembrance is memory. Memory is experience. The things we talked about—all gone. I can revive them and say they are very actual, very living. But it is reviving a dead thing, right? And when I do that, what's happened to the brain? It is being clogged by things which are gone.

PNS: Unnecessary.

K: No. Gone! Don't use that word; then they will begin to ask what is necessary, what is not necessary. So the brain is living on past memories, on dead things, which have an emotional impact if revived. If it doesn't revive and keep on thinking, it just becomes a sloppy little machine. Would you agree to all this? Not agree, do you see the fact? I am living on something which is dead, and therefore my brain also dies. I wonder if you see this?

Q3: You said the emotional response is real; therefore if it is pleasurable, I would like to recall it.

K: Yes. Which means what? I have derived pleasure from a dead thing, from dead memories. Memories are always dead, right? And I am deriving, out of a dead body, pleasure.

SF: Is it pleasure that gives it its force?

K: Its force, its vitality, its sense of loyalty: 'I must be loyal to my brother, he died so long ago, we liked each other'—you know all that.

SF: But it is pleasure that keeps it going.

K: Pleasure and the constant repetition of it. I have a picture on my mantelpiece, and I look at it every day. You know all these things that go on with human beings. My image is all that. So my brain is living on a dead carcass. I am purposely using the word *carcass*. So what has happened to my brain?

PNS: It is deteriorating.

K: Haven't you seen old ladies and old men who are living in the past?

PNS: Yes, we are also living in the past.

K: Ah, I am being polite. [*Laughter*] So the brain is never fresh. Now you are getting the relationship? My wife has a memory of me, an image of me, and she is living on that, and I am living on my image about her—two dead things. And the relationship is between these two dead things, each giving it life. So battle, conflict. So the next question is: Is it possible to live without any image?

PNS: But it's very active.

K: No, just listen first. Is it possible to live without a single image? Not how to...

PNS: ...control it.

K: ...control it, how not to do it, how to live. But first of all put the question.

Q1: Krishnaji, you were saying that we are not living; we are living in the past, we are dead.

K: More or less dead. That's what I said.

Q1: Then the only way of living is to leave the past.

K: That was my question: Is it possible to live a daily life without a single image, which then causes conflict, which then brings a division? As long as I have an image about you and you have an image about me, those very images are a

divisive process. They divide, right? Now the question is: can you and I live without a single image?

PNS: Totally unattached.

K: Ah no, no. You see, you are ready to answer, but see what is implied in the question.

PNS: I'm not trying to find an answer.

K: I'm not trying to find the answer. I have put the question to see the implication of that question, which is: If I have an image about India and I belong to that tribe, can I live without the image of India, without the image of the flag, without the idea that I am a Brahmin, non-Brahmin, all that? They are all images. Can I live that way? Of course those are fairly easy—not to belong to any country, all that. Then is it possible to live without any conclusion, which is an image? That is, can I live without an end, a purpose, a goal? As long as I have a purpose, a goal, and you have a purpose, we will be at loggerheads. If you are a communist and I am a democrat, if you are a Marxist and I am a capitalist, there is inevitable division. So I see that as long as I have an image, as an Arab, a Jew, British and so on, there must be division, and therefore there must be conflict. So can I live without a single image? What do you say? First see what the content of the question is. The image is the tradition. That tradition may be yesterday's tradition or a thousand years' tradition; it is still a repetition from yesterday to today to tomorrow. So ask yourself whether you can live without a single image. If I say in all humility that I have no image about anything, you will say, 'You are crazy.'

PNS: I won't say it.

K: Why not? You will say I am living in an illusion. I say no. I see the nature of images and the destructive nature of the images, the divisive nature of images, which brings conflict. And a religious person has no conflict. That is not an ideal. I see that as a fact, so it's finished. I have no images. *If* I see the fact. But if you say, 'Why should I not have images?' we can discuss it. But you see the fact, a simple fact, that where there is division there must be conflict. There is the Jew and the Arab, the Muslim and the Hindu, the Christian; you do puja, I don't do puja; you go to the Mass, I don't go. So where there is division, there must be conflict. And the nature of division is the beginning of images—ideological images, historical images, conclusions from a historical study of Marx, coming to a conclusion and holding on to that conclusion and working everything round that conclusion, which the communists, the totalitarian people are doing. That is creating division. And the democrats and the capitalists are doing their stuff, right?

RD: Krishnaji, are you saying that the very seeing the nature of division ends the division?

K: Yes.

SF: Then it implies that the seeing of this division has more vitality and more force than...

K: Obviously, obviously.

SF: If that is true, Krishnaji, why do we then maintain the division?

K: I will show you in a minute. K has explained very, very carefully the whole nature of division—separativeness through ideation, ideals, conclusions, definitions, and so on. And each one of us chooses one and clings to it—I prefer Marxism, you prefer capitalism, and so on. So each one builds an image and holds on to it. And the image is a dead thing; it's like shutting all the windows, hoping thereby to find some kind of security in that. Right? So conflict arises where there is division. Full stop.

RD: One brain sees this and says that the very seeing ends it.

K: Yes.

RD: And the other brain...

K: ...doesn't see it.

RD: No. The other brain says, 'I see that images are divisive', but that itself is one more image or one more conclusion.

K: Of course, of course. That means what? That is, the speaker K is seeing the fact and holding on to the fact, the reality of it. You hear it: verbal communication takes place. You draw a picture of it, an idea of it, and hold on to that idea, but you do not see the fact.

RD: Right. Now K points it out, and this man says yes.

K: No, you don't see. Either you see it or you don't see it. Don't say, 'I see it.'

GN: I think he is trying to say: 'I can say to myself that I am seeing, but actually I am not seeing.'

K: Of course. I mean that's simple enough.

GN: The question ‘Is it possible to be without images?’ is a question of far-reaching depth. How does one give depth and vitality to something that is real? Because the image-making mechanism seeps in very quickly.

K: Look, once you see that something is dangerous, it is over. You don’t go to the precipice each time and say, ‘Ah, I must run away from it.’ You see the danger of it, and it is not seeing it one moment and not seeing it the next. When you see danger, when you see poison, when you see something terrible, it is finished; you don’t go near it. But we refuse—not refuse—we don’t want to listen.

SF: Why, sir?

K: Because it is too damned disturbing. I have found security in my image, and you come along and tell me. I hear you, but I don’t...

SF: But the fact is that it really doesn’t give security.

K: You *say* that.

SF: But it is a fact.

K: Britain, France, Germany, Russia, each one knows that isolation is the most dangerous thing.

SF: But they maintain it.

K: But they maintain it. Why? It is simple: the politicians, the voters being ‘British, British, British’...

SF: But then at an individual level...

K: ...it is the same process.

SF: But we can see that it breeds tremendous insecurity and yet...

GN: ...we continue with it.

K: Which means what? You are a damn fool. [*Laughter*]

RH: Can’t one say that the question ‘Can one live without an image?’ you pose for us, but we don’t pose it to ourselves?

K: That’s what I am telling you. If you put that question to yourself, what would be your answer? Have you put that question to yourself?

PNS: Yes.

K: Then what takes place?

PNS: I would very much like everyone else to live that way; I can't say anything about myself. [*Laughter*]

K: Yes. Let them all stop war first, then I will stop war. I know, the good old stuff.

HP: My response to that question would be: I would be watching the images as they come, which means being in touch with what is happening.

K: Then you take years.

HP: No. It is just watching thoughts. It is not seeking freedom from images but being in touch with them.

K: Why do you complicate these questions? I am asking you a very simple question. I have lived with images, you come along and put that question to me. Then I ask, 'Am I putting this question to myself, or am I just repeating the question?' You understand? Have you put that question to yourself?

HP: Without putting that question to yourself, you can watch what is happening.

K: Jesus! After coming to a certain point, through all this morning's dialogue, you have put that question to me. This chap puts that question to me and I ask, 'Is it his question or my question?' If it is my question, what's my answer to it?

RD: When you ask that question...

K: I haven't asked it; you have asked it of yourself.

RD: I'm saying that in today's dialogue you asked that question, put that question verbally. At moments I noticed answers coming from me, and I brushed them aside. Then I realized how difficult it was for me to even put the question. I was all the time noticing that my mind was not putting the question.

K: Now, after saying all this, put that question.

RD: I put it, sir. There was no answer, the mind was silent.

K: What do you mean there was no answer?

RD: There was no answer, the mind was silent.

K: Or you are refusing to answer? You don't want to answer?

RD: But I am asking the question of myself.

K: Ah, you can ask it. But unconsciously, deeply, you say, 'For God's sake, I'll keep quiet.' When you say, 'I have put the question', put it, not casually. I want to know if it is possible to live without one image. What does that mean? I have no image. Suppose my wife has an image, what is my relationship to her? If I said to her, 'Sorry, old girl, I have no image about you', she says, 'What the hell are you talking about? Does it mean you have no relationship?' And I say, 'No, darling, that is not the question.' [*Laughs*] We begin to argue. But see what happens. I have no image—about India, about Europe, about myself, about my wife; I have no image. And I am related to my wife. What is my action? She says, 'If you have no image, are you detached from me, are you not attached to me?' If I say, 'No, darling, I am not', what would she say? She would pick up the nearest handy thing and throw it at me if she has got the guts. Why don't you face all this?

Go on, put that question to yourself and see what the response is. That is real freedom, you understand? Not to have a single image about anything.

Could we put the question differently? Is affection, love, put together by images? Is love—a much-abused word—related to images? If I have an image about you, can I love you?

AK: Then I will be loving only the image.

K: Yes, sir. The image is the product of thought, the image has been put together by thought. Are you clear on this?

PNS: Yes.

K: Are you sure?

PNS: Yes.

K: Thought is memory, thought is knowledge, thought is experience—experience, knowledge, memory. Thought has built this image. Therefore is thought affection? Is thought love?

PNS: What is affection?

K: Wait. I am asking you. Thinking about my wife—is that love?

PNS: It is thought.

K: I am asking you, is that love?

PNS: I don’t know what love is, so I can’t say.

K: All right. Is thinking love? For God’s sake!

PNS: I don’t think so. It is not.

K: Why do you say it is not?

PNS: If thinking is love, then it is a very limited thing.

K: But when I think, when I write a postcard from Goa to my wife—‘Darling, I am thinking about you’—she feels flattered, she calls that love. Right? What are you all smiling at? So thinking about her—is that love?

PNS: No.

K: Do you know what we are saying? We are reversing the whole process of human relationship. I have a picture of my wife on the mantelpiece. You understand what that means? I call that love.

PNS: It’s not love.

K: Don’t say it is not love. I call it love because I am thinking about her, I am lonely, I am miserable, I am depressed without her. And all this I call my love for her. No? You are married ladies, what do you say? Or unmarried people, what do you all say to this? So do you realize that when we say love has no relationship to thought, you have upset the whole applecart of human relationship?

So now I come back: does a religious mind have conflict? When a group of us are working together—and I hope we are working with our hearts and minds—if there is dissension, disagreement, why do we have conflict about it? Can we dissolve the disagreement immediately and not carry it over?

AP: In our consciousness we give a certain weight to thought.

K: Yes, weight.

AP: We carry it with us like we carry a convenient piece of luggage.

K: Yes.

AP: Now, we can’t conceive of being without that because we would feel very bereft if...

K: Yes, we said all that.

AP: Now, what I want to say is that you have very graphically, almost out of time, placed us in a totally new context, and still we go and live our old life, go and teach mathematics, go and do this, do that. I wonder if we see...

K: ...how extraordinarily difficult it is.

AP: No. The kind of situation which we get into.

K: I think any situation, if there is this quality of intelligence, is solved. After all, if I have affection for you, I would see that a disagreement never arose between us. It is my job, my responsibility to see that there is no dissension because I won't take a stand about anything. I am willing to examine, which doesn't mean that I am yielding. I don't start from a posit and then move from that. I say I have no ground on which to stand in the psychological sense, and so I am willing to move, and if there is a disagreement between him and me, I'd say, 'Look, let's talk about it.' Not wait till day after tomorrow. I would say, 'Let's meet this afternoon, let's talk about it so that there is no wall between us.' This way I have functioned, I'll function. But if you refuse to do that, well, it is up to you; I can't force you.

So could we have a religious mind, a religious group that has no belief—in God, in the future—belief on which most people thrive? Which means belief and faith go together. Then what was the next? No ideals, conclusions, definitions, concepts, or holding on to concepts. I study Marx and agree with his conclusions and stick to the conclusions; it is a stupid thing to do. So no belief, no ideals, and no conflict—can we live that way?

Then, next, all this implies cooperation. Can we cooperate to build together a religious centre here? Not an *ashrama* in the old sense, which is an abomination, but a religious group. Because they are religious they have a new kind of vitality, because they are free. If you have no belief, you are an extraordinarily free person already. No ideals, no conflict, you understand? That is, we cooperate without a person, not around a person, not around a belief, not around an ideal, but there is the spirit of cooperation, which is totally different from cooperating for something or about something. Have you got that? What does that mean?

Q4: It means I want to learn, so I don't have anything fixed.

K: Yes, then you have this spirit of cooperation. Suppose you have it: which means no authority; you are not cooperating because of something or about something or for something. No cause, no person, no ideal; therefore you have the feeling of wanting to work together. If I don't want to, how will you deal with me? Because it's going to happen. How will you deal with me? This is a problem in this school, isn't it? If a few people, a few of you have got this feeling of really wanting to cooperate and I haven't, how will you deal with me? You want to help me to break down my ideals and all the rest of it; how will you help me? Have you got that feeling of cooperation? Which doesn't exist in India, right? They all want to cooperate with Mrs Gandhi, of course, or around a guru

or around a business motive, for personal gain, and there nobody says, ‘Let’s cooperate without a purpose.’ They won’t even know what the thing means. But if you understand it, and if you have got that spirit and I haven’t, what will you do with me? You have got me here in this place; what will you do? What is your responsibility to me?

PNS: I will give my life to explain it.

K: Yes, but find out what you will do with me. This is happening now. What will you do, if you have that spirit? Have you got that spirit? Don’t say ‘sometimes’; that’s an awful word. Have you? Don’t take long, sir. I am gone.

RD: I cannot answer you.

K: Why not? You understand what it means? It is so simple.

RD: Sir, don’t say it is simple.

K: It is terribly simple.

RD: Then why do we feel so hesitant?

K: I don’t know, I am asking you.

RD: Or we are making it too complicated?

K: You are making it all so complicated.

RD: Yes. With the result we are not able to say, ‘Yes, we mean that.’

K: Yes.

RD: What is it that prevents us?

K: I will show you. First put that question. Have you this spirit of cooperation which is not for a purpose, not around a person, not around an ideal? Let’s all build an *ashrama*. We all want to build a new house, we all want to build it, right? Do you?

RD: Yes.

K: Yes, that’s all. If we really want to build a new house, we employ an architect, and you and I agree to have so many windows, so many doors; we agree on the size of the rooms, the kind of roof, the right kind of insulation, this and that. It means that before we build a house together, we must have the urge to build, the

feeling that we must create a new thing. Not ideals. Surely you have got it; any thinking person must have this. Or you are dead to all this?

RD: No, we are not dead to this.

K: So you have it. Keep it simple. And it becomes very complex later. But you see the complexity and you are stuck.

RD: No. If one starts with simplicity, you suddenly bring up something very complex.

K: I will, I will, but begin simply.

RD: Yes.

K: Sir, have you ever noticed how a tree grows? It is so simple, the beginning—it puts out a little thing, gradually moves, moves, until it becomes a gigantic tree. But you start with the gigantic. I start with the lowest thing.

Now I ask, how can you have this feeling of cooperation? See, motive is always personal, or the personal is identified with a greater motive. So these are all a process of limiting cooperation, but we are wiping all that out, and therefore there is this extraordinary feeling of cooperating, working together. So no beliefs, no ideals, no conflict, and there is this sense of deep cooperation. You've got it, sir, haven't you? All this implies affection, care, love. What do you say? You are all keeping quiet. So is Rishi Valley becoming a religious centre?

AP: We have seen all this, this morning, through your eyes. I feel it is necessary for us to see this on our own.

K: Of course.

AP: Because unless we see, each one for himself, that we do this journey alone...

K: Yes, sir.

AP: This will come into being if each one working on this sees it all for himself.

K: If you don't see it for yourself, if I die tomorrow, you won't have this.

AP: No. I think we have seen something, but we must see that we have seen it through your eyes today; it is necessary to see it through our own eyes.

K: Yes, sir. That's why I say, 'Put the question to yourself, look at it.' I can see the yoga teacher showing me all the lessons, but I have to do it myself, right? I can't live on him.

Rishi Valley, 17 December 1982

Discussions in Madras

5

Are We Human Beings or Professionals?

Are we teachers first or human beings first?—As human beings, are we flowering?—The human being is more important than the profession—Both teachers and students are a bundle of instincts, emotions, contradictions—There is the feeling that we must bring about good human beings—Why have I made it a problem?—I approach this problem as a professional—Mind is trained to look at life from a professional viewpoint—Inwardly I am not going to make anything into a problem.

Krishnamurti (K): I thought that we from Rajghat, Rishi Valley, Bangalore, and Madras should meet to talk together. First of all, what do you consider is our responsibility, not only to the school, to the students, but also to the environment? As these schools are in this part of the world, what's our responsibility to this so-called India, which is breaking up very rapidly? And what is our responsibility to the other schools: Brockwood and Ojai? When you take all these schools together, what's your feeling about them? How do you look at it all? That's one question.

The other thing I'd like to ask is: Are we teachers first or human beings first? On what do you lay emphasis—on teachers or on human beings? Or an executive or something or the other? Do you regard the profession as being more important than the human being? And what's your action with regard to a group of people who have gathered together from Rishi Valley, Rajghat, and Bangalore, saying, 'Really, we are deeply involved'? (I am not using the words *committed* or *dedicated*.) They are deeply concerned with the teachings, and what does it mean to be concerned, and what is the action of that concern? And as human beings, are we flowering?—I don't like to use the word *evolve*. Are we as a group of people who are concerned with the teachings, and who have perhaps studied the teachings and been soaked in it, are we as human beings flowering? Which doesn't admit time; not 'I will gradually flower.' So there it is, right? Are we flowering? Do we place human beings first or teachers first? What's the other thing?

KJ: Our responsibility to all the K schools.

K: Yes. Now, I like to start not with responsibility; but are we flowering? I'd like to start with that. You understand what I mean by flowering?

AP: Would it not be better if we go first to your basic question: are we thinking as human beings or as professionals? Because flowering will begin from there.

K: I don’t mind starting with anything, but if you want to start with that, go ahead. Are we human beings first and teachers afterwards, human beings first and scientists, mathematicians, etc., afterwards? What does it mean to you to be a human being first? Not a description, not a definition, you understand? If we define, you will agree, disagree, and quarrel over words. But if we can put aside the definition, the meaning of the word *human* according to a dictionary, what does it mean to you to be a human? We are not animals; perhaps deep down we may have all the instincts of the animal, but we are not actually living in the forests and so on. So what does it mean to be a human? Isn’t it a very good question?

PNS: When we are children, the mind and the heart are together. When we grow older, they get separated.

K: What do you mean by that? Go on, explain to me. What does it mean to each of us to be really human beings?

RD: Perhaps it means always seeking something and never finding it.

K: Is that what you call a human being?

KPK: To me, a human being means the physical body plus the thoughts, the desires, the ambitions, and all the psychological structure that he carries with him.

PNS: We become professionals first and don’t give importance to the human element. When we look at people, we look from the knowledge we have acquired.

K: Before you answer that question, how do you investigate, or how do you receive, or how do you approach the question? I am asking you, if I may, what is a human being? We have agreed that the human being is far more important than the profession—being an engineer, being a scientist, being a teacher, being an administrator. Human beings are far more important than that by which they earn money and so on. Now, how do you listen to that question, how do you respond to that question, what’s your reaction to that question? [*Pause*] If you put that question to me, I really don’t know. I really don’t know what a human being is, one who feels, thinks, acts, has pain, sorrow. A human being—what is he? All that? Or is there something beyond all that? Or there is nothing at all beyond all that? So this, I think, is a fairly important question because if you can find out what is it to be completely human, then perhaps you can help the student to be complete, to be whole. So please discuss it with me.

RH: Sir, can we put it in the following way? A human being is a cluster of instincts, emotions, and intellect, which are in a certain amount of...

K: A cluster of instincts, sensory responses; the intellectual capacity to discern, to choose, to act; some talents, some gifts; and some character, tendencies, idiosyncrasies.

RH: And they are in some kind of disorder.

K: Yes, disorder. Is that what we are? Obviously, obviously. Would you agree? Is that the totality of a human being? Disorderly in his attitudes, contradictory in his actions, having conflicting tendencies, hypocrisy—you know the whole bundle of all this. Is that what we are? And if we are that, are we aware that we are that? Are we aware of this mixture, these contradictions, these comparative values, the ethical, artistic, or professional gifts? Are we aware of the layers of all this or the content of all this? And if we are, what do we do? And the student is also this. The rest of humanity, society is this. The whole structure of the human being is divisive, contradictory, fragmentary, broken up. Is that what we are? The wandering desires, uncertainty, not knowing what to do, seeking security, and so on—is that what we are? Obviously we are that. Then what is our relationship with another?

PNS: It is from that.

K: No, sir. Look at the word, what does it mean? I am all that and you are all that. What's your relationship to each other and therefore to the students, therefore to the world, to society, and all the rest of it? What is my relationship? As a human being who is a bundle of all this, what am I to do, how am I to act or think? As a human being, a student, what's my action, what's my relationship? You're all mostly teachers, right? What's our relationship?

RD: I feel we should pursue the question of our being with the reality of oneself.

K: This is the reality of myself.

RD: What happens is that I have a tendency to move away from this reality.

K: No. I'm this. Even if I move away, I am still this.

RD: Because once I identify myself with some function or idea, my relationship with the student is then from that.

K: Yes. So first I said that every form of identification with an idea, with a conclusion is a contradictory state. And if I act from that contradictory state of ideas and conclusions and judgements, that's a totally different activity in my relationship with the student, with another human being. But if I recognize that I am a bundle of all this and the student is also a bundle of all this, how do I deal with it? What's my response to the other?

Q2: Fragmentary, full of contradictions?

K: Yes. Therefore what happens? My relationship with you is based on this fragmentation, and your relationship with me is also similar. Then from that what takes place? The student comes fragmented, and he is all those fragments put together. And I am also many fragments put together—*fasces*, which means bundle. (You know, *fascism* comes from the word *fasces*.) So I am this bundle and he is that bundle.

KPK: So there is no relationship as such; there is only conflict.

K: Yes. What shall I do? What's my relationship or my responsibility or my sense of action when I am this and he is that? See, it is quite an interesting question. Face it, look at it first, don't answer the question. You are too quick to answer the question, all of you. Don't answer the question; first look at it, feel it. We have intellectually described it, that we are bundles of all this, but the words don't convey the feeling behind it, the feeling that I am a bundle of many factors, many contradictions. I'm all that. Listen to it, the movement of it, feel your way into it. You are also a bundle—the thinker who is looking at it. So feel it, look at it, listen to it. If I may most respectfully point out, don't jump to conclusions, answers.

KPK: In our relationships there are reactions. Our relationship is one of reaction from this bundle.

K: I am just saying that when you put a question to me, I wait, look at the question, not wanting to answer. You are all ready to answer, whereas I am looking at the question, I am looking at it in depth or superficially. You're looking at it for an immediate answer. Or there is no answer. You are all here as teachers, a group of teachers from all these schools. You are concerned as a human being with bringing about a different type of children, not the mediocre, clever, stupid children; certainly not clever—that denies intelligence. You are concerned primarily as a human being with bringing about a different mind, a different quality of mind, a mind that has the depth of heart, with the mind in the heart. I know for myself that I am a bundle of contradictions. Now, how do I deal with this? I want to create, bring about, a really good, highly sensitive, intelligent human being. (I am using the word *intelligent* not in the ordinary sense of one who is very clever, who passes exams, and struts about like an idiot.) That's what I want to do. I feel that is absolutely necessary, not as an idea or as an ideal because I reject all that. I feel this is the most important thing to do in life, for myself. I know I am a bundle and he is a bundle, so how shall I bring this about—a good, excellent, human being?[1]

[1] In this discussion and the next one, Krishnamurti uses the phrases *a bundle* and *the good* to indicate, respectively, that the teachers as well as the students are made up of various psychological factors and that there is the need to bring about good human beings.

EWA: Isn't there a missing factor in this—the quality of affection?

K: Affection has also its contradictions: I like you one day, you do something which I don't like, and I don't like you the next day. I love you, but I am jealous of you because you are more clever, more intelligent, brighter, nicer looking than I am. There is a contradiction, you follow? That is, we live in contradiction, including in our affection. It's so obvious.

RD: Affection of a very different kind.

K: Ah, no. That's an idea.

RD: No. Affection of a very different kind comes into being once you are aware that you are a bundle of contradictions and the child is a bundle of contradictions. You're afraid to stay with that thing.

K: I am asking you to look at it, sir.

RH: Even if I have the intellectual awareness that everybody is a bundle, there is still the sense that I must impose order on the bundle that is outside as well as on the bundle that is inside.

K: She says one is aware of it, which is not an intellectual process. I am aware: that is, I feel, I know, I recognize, I see the actual fact, not the theory of it, not the idea of it. You are a bundle, and she is also that, and I say I have this feeling that we must bring about a good human being because we are related to the school. If I were by myself with my wife, I could talk it over and go into it, either accept it or break it. But we are concerned with a whole group of children; otherwise you and I wouldn't be here, you and I wouldn't be talking. We are concerned with children, and we also recognize that both the child and we are a bundle. Now, what shall I do? There are these three factors: I am a bundle, he's a bundle, and also while the school exists I must do something to bring about a good human being. So these three factors are my life, and that's why we as teachers are specially meeting. What shall I do? [*Long pause*] Go on, sirs, I am not going to answer this; this is your problem. Now, what will you do with the problem?

Q2: After a complete, total understanding that I am also a fragment...

K: Will that take time?

Q2: It's not a temporal process.

K: When you say, 'I must understand myself', do you mean that it will take time to understand myself? And in the meantime I have got responsibility for those children. Not only for the children; I have responsibility to the other human beings.

Q3: It seems to me one of our problems is that we are not capable of seeing a really complex thing if it has many layers. We can see only one contradiction and never the bundle all at once.

K: Are you saying that we are not completely aware of this whole activity of the bundles?

Q3: Yes, that's what I am saying.

K: Why?

Q3: We are aware, but we are not aware in the other way you are speaking about.

K: Yes. Just to be aware of it. I am aware of those palms, those coconut trees because they are objective, visual, palpable. But this is also visible in a different sense, palpable—you feel it.

Q3: I don't see it rightly. I don't see the complex thing that way.

K: Why?

RH: Because I am trying to gather the bundle into a shape or a pattern.

K: This is a problem, right? I want my son or my daughter to be a very good human being. Also I know I'm fragmented, he's fragmented. It happens to be that way, life is apparently that way. Even in children it's begun already. Now, this is an issue that I must resolve. I can't talk about it. I can't say, 'Well, let's think it over.' It is a problem, a crisis. I've got to face the crisis and what comes out of that.

PNS: The student or I or whoever it is must be able to see that...

K: Not one 'must'...

PNS: ...with one's whole being.

K: No, sir. You and I are fragmented. And you and I have a responsibility because we have the children, and we do want those children to be excellent human beings. That's a problem. Now, how do you deal with the problem? Don't answer it, don't answer it, look at it carefully. You know how to deal with a professional problem—engineering, biology—you take time, you study it, you go into it, discuss with the professors. Now, here is a problem which probably nobody has posed. They may have. We are not saying we are the originators of the problem—we may be. How do you look at the problem, how do you receive the problem, how do you respond to the problem? How do you weigh it, look at it, feel it, smell it, taste it? How do you?

Suppose you and I don't get on well together. Fortunately, that doesn't happen for the moment. It may happen next year, but for the moment you and I are fairly friendly; it's no problem. But as we live in the same house, we begin to have rows, we grumble. I insist and you insist, so gradually there is trouble between us. That's a problem. How do you first create the problem? Listen carefully. How do you create the problem, bring the problem about, and then having brought it about, how do you resolve it, how do you approach it, smell it, taste it? What does that problem mean to you? This is a human problem, not a scientific problem, not a computer problem. Go on, talk to me.

PNS: I think you definitely can't approach it from the bundle.

K: No, no, no. That's the only thing you have. Don't move away from it, don't invent another bundle, don't invent an ideal, don't invent an answer.

PNS: I think we just put the question and leave it alone.

K: You can't leave it alone.

PNS: I feel the question.

K: You're too quick to answer, go slowly. I have this problem: I am a bundle and he also is, and I want him and myself to be good, excellent, human beings, and it is a problem. Why have I made it a problem? Think it out a little, don't answer it yet. Why has it become a problem? Is it because my brain, my mind, has been trained to resolve problems? I have to build a bridge; it's a problem, so I go into it, study the structure, all the rest of it, and then I resolve the problem. I ask, are our minds trained to resolve problems? Obviously they are. Let's look at it, all of us here. But let's ask the question first: Why do we create a problem? Why has this become a problem? Since we have made it a problem, the mind is now active in the resolution of that problem. And the mind is trained to resolve problems, you understand? See what has happened, go into it, take it slowly. What's happened? First I said I am a bundle, the student is a bundle, and we feel that it is absolutely necessary to create marvellous human beings. And this has become a problem to us: how, I being a bundle and he being a bundle, we can bring about a good human being who is whole, holistic, and all the rest of it. Then I say, 'By Jove, what a problem it is, I must resolve it.' So I discover that my brain, my mind, has been trained, conditioned, educated, to resolve problems. I carry the same mentality over to this, right? So my brain is trained to solve problems. I have discovered that. But why do we *make* it into a problem which *has* to be resolved? Why? We don't ask, *Is* it a problem? If you ask, 'Is it a problem?' you've already moved to a different level. Have you?

RH: So it is habit that makes me approach this question in the same way I approach other problems.

K: Yes. So I have moved away from my habit. Have you? Are you still trying to resolve the problem? Do you understand? Go into it. There is a political problem now: all the South is breaking away from the Centre, and it is becoming a tremendous problem for the politicians in the North and the politicians in the South. Follow it carefully. Why have they created the problem? I am asking: Is the mind, which has been trained to resolving problems, approaching this problem which you have with the habit, with the conditioning, with the educated mind which says, 'I must resolve it'? Therefore you are following the same pattern. But can you ask: 'Now, why has it become a problem? Who has made it into a problem?'?

RS: When I try to look at the bundle, which is the 'me', I find that I am not able to really feel it out. If I am capable of feeling it, that itself may be the answer to how I am going to approach the child. Don't you think that not having observed the bundle in operation in the past is the real reason why I am not able to see it while I am sitting here and talking with you?

K: No, that's not my question.

RS: I understand your question, but I am describing to you my response.

K: I know, but you have not answered my question. I am asking, if I may, 'Why has this become a problem?' Have you approached it as a problem and therefore the mind is ready to find a solution to that problem by our discussing? Or does the mind ask, 'Why have I created it?'? Am I still following the same old pattern, of being an engineer, a scientist, which is the approach of the professional, not the human? We said human beings come first, then the scientist, but we have still the same mentality. My brain has said, 'I am not a professional, I am first a human being', but I have approached this problem not as a human being but as a professional. Which is, I am an engineer, I know the problems there, and I've resolved some of them. With the same mentality I say I must resolve this problem; therefore I am still a professional, not a human being. Do you see that?

PNS: Yes.

K: Is it true, what I am saying?

PNS: Yes, I am seeing only from my...

K: Yes, that's it. You see it only as a thing to be resolved. As an expert you said, 'That must be solved.' So you are bringing the same mentality to this, which means you are looking at this...

PNS: And you're not free.

K: No, it is not a question of freedom. You and I agree that we are first human beings and secondly scientists or mathematicians.

PNS: But I may not be a human being first because I have my bundle.

K: Just listen. Both of us have agreed that we are first human beings, whatever that is. After that we are scientists, teachers, professionals. You agreed just now.

PNS: Yes.

K: Right? You are a human being first.

PNS: Yes.

K: Now, that human being is a bundle, and the student is a bundle. And we've said to ourselves, 'By Jove, we would like to create a really good human being. He is a bundle, I am a bundle, and I am looking at it as a problem.'

PNS: Because I have opted to.

K: No, I am looking at it as a problem. Which is, my brain, my mind, has been trained to resolve problems. My brain, my mind, has been trained like a professional who is an expert, who is capable of resolving problems. He's been trained to resolve problems, and with that same mentality he is approaching this: I am a fragment, a bundle, he is a bundle, and we must create good human beings—that is a problem. And your brain, your mind, has been trained to resolve problems, so you treat this as a problem. You get it?

PNS: Actually it is not a problem.

K: You treat it as a problem, and your mind is occupied in resolving the problem. So somebody comes along and asks, 'Why do you make it into a problem?' Listen, why do you make it into a problem? If you make it into a problem, your mind then is resolving it. Got it?

PNS: Yes.

K: So why do you make it a problem?

RD: Are you saying it is not a problem?

K: No, I am not. You don't even go into this. My wife and I quarrel and I say, 'By Jove, it must stop.' If I like to keep up the quarrel, that's a different matter. When I say to myself, 'This is an impossible position', it has become a problem, I must find an answer. I yield and she yields, but my brain, mind, has been trained to resolve problems. So I ask, 'Why have I made this thing—my bundle,

his bundle, and the good—into a problem?' If I have not made it into a problem, I may look at it differently.

PNS: Yes.

K: Are you quite sure?

PNS: Very sure. As you look at a tree, you look at this.

K: No. I am not looking at the tree. I am asking, 'Why have I made it into a problem? What's the reason for it?' Why have I made it into a problem?

PNS: Because we want to resolve it.

K: No!

Q1: Because of memory...

K: Which means what?

Q1: The conditioning...

K: Which means you are still looking at the blasted thing professionally. If you can get that into your skull—you keep on repeating this thing.

HP: Something becomes a problem when the mind is disturbed.

K: Don't go into the mind being disturbed. The mind, you're saying, is disturbed; therefore it's a problem. And how do you resolve that problem?

HP: You can't; it has to resolve itself.

RH: Can we put it another way? Can we look at the situation non-professionally?

K: That's all I've been saying.

KPK: We can't, because the mind is already conditioned to look at everything professionally. It feels alive and active in doing so.

K: Your mind is trained to look at life from a professional point of view. That means you are a scientist first, not a human being.

PNS: We are trained to look only with the intellect.

K: If you make a statement like that, you've stopped, you have come to a conclusion. And then that conclusion creates a problem, and you're back again. I want to make this so clear that you can't mess around with it.

RS: There are several people here who have been listening to you for several years. Don't you think that the question which you posed just now of why the mind looks at things professionally may not be real to all the people here?

K: I don't know. Ask them, sir, ask them.

Q3: If one is not professionally trained, then can we say that one looks at it differently?

K: I may not be professionally trained, but I have always a problem which I must resolve. I am not a professional, but I am married and we quarrel, we have rows, and that has brought about a problem. Then I proceed to ask, 'My God, what am I to do?'

Q3: That's how we approach it.

K: Yes. My mind is looking for an answer, but it doesn't ask, why has this become a problem? You are a computer expert; what do you say to this?

Q3: We are always approaching problems through our knowledge.

K: All right, go on that way. So your knowledge is telling you that you must resolve it. Knowledge is a professional job. [*Laughs*] Come back to it: what will you do? Now I ask, 'Is this a problem?' These three—is this a problem? We want a good, excellent, affectionate human being, an intelligent human being, and we both are fragmented. Right? First of all, I don't make it into a problem. I haven't made it a problem because I refuse to resolve a problem. But I want to know why I have created it. See the difference? You want to resolve it, I don't. I ask, 'Why have I made this problem?' and so I won't *treat* it as a problem. So my mind is not occupied with the resolution of it. Is this clear? This seems so logical. So if I don't treat it as a problem, then what happens?

Q2: It ceases to be a problem.

K: I haven't made it into a problem, so it can't cease.

Q2: It's not there.

K: No, it is there.

KPK: But the mind is no longer occupied with it.

K: You are no longer occupied with the issue?

KPK: The mind is observing, watching, it.

AK: Aren't we simply deleting that word *problem*?

K: Personally I refuse to have problems. There is a situation which is arising now; I first see it, and I am not making it into a problem.

HP: You are not making it a problem because you are very clear.

K: No. I refuse to make my life into a problem.

Q4: Are you trying to erase the process of conflict?

K: Conflict arises when I've a problem.

RH: She asks, are you trying to erase the conflict?

K: No. I have no problems.

RH: So there is no question, there is nothing to erase.

Q4: At the same time the problem seems to be: why is one incapable of putting such a primary question from the depths of one's being?

K: No, no. You see, the problem is that you are *insisting* it is a problem.

Q4: I am not insisting that it is a problem. I say it is a problem because I am approaching it intellectually.

K: No, no.

Q4: At the same time I am not able to meet that situation from the depth, from the core of my being. Am I making myself clear?

K: It's clear, what you're saying. You are repeating the same thing.

Q4: I am not. I think I am not.

K: Go on.

Q4: You say the problem doesn't exist.

K: I didn't. I did not say that.

Q4: You said the problem is something we have created.

K: No.

Q4: Are you trying to say that the problem is there because there is a conflict?

K: Yes, I agree, I agree. He said, 'when the mind is disturbed'. I am just saying that as a human being, an ordinary human being from Rishi Valley or Madanapalle, I refuse to have problems.

RS: It's not seen as ignoring facts.

K: Yes. You understand what has happened? Look, sir, there is the good, the bundle, the bundle—my mind has said that it is a problem. I may be a cuckoo, but I say it is not a problem, I won't *make* it into a problem. Because my mind isn't trained to resolve problems, my mind is free to look at the problem. And therefore it's free, and therefore it's not a problem. Got it? Go slowly at it. So the thing exists. Now, it's not a problem to me. That's the first thing: it's not a problem to me. I refuse to have a mind which says, 'I must resolve it.' That training is put aside completely. I see it's silly when you've got something very alive. So I approach it without treating it as a problem. I treat it as not a problem, therefore what is it then?

RH: The bundle is alive, and I am alive with the bundle.

K: Yes. You are saying both the bundles are alive and the other—the good—is also alive. Is that so? I am questioning, I'm not doubting. Would you say—I am just asking—that when the mind is not making a problem of anything, such a mind is entirely different from the mind which is always resolving problems? Such a brain has no problems. I want to emphasize this. So how do I look at it? Not as a problem, right? How do I look at it?

Q4: It's a state in which the bundle of conflicts ceases to exist.

K: Yes, it ceases to exist. But you have this; what will you do?

PS: We have to see the likes and dislikes.

K: No, no. It's not a question of like and dislike. There are these three things. I have to do something; I cannot just say, 'Yes, I have no problems.' I have to do something, and I am doing it without making it into a problem. That's the first thing I have realized.

PS: You must go into it.

K: No, the first thing I have realized is that it is not a problem, and I am *not* going to make it into a problem. But the thing remains, right? What shall I do?

HP: There is no asking, ‘What shall I do?’ If you make up your mind that...

K: I never said it. When I said ‘shall’, it means ‘What is the movement?’ It’s not that I have made up my mind; I haven’t.

Q3: When we put a question like that, what happens to us is that it becomes hypothetical. When you put the question, we are never able to face the reality that we face in real life.

K: I am objecting to something much deeper, which is: you never say, ‘I don’t know.’

Q3: Yes.

K: Wait. You understand, sir? I don’t know; it’s there. I really don’t know. (I’m talking for myself.) As I have no problems, when this question is put in front of me—two bundles and goodness—I don’t know what to do with it. I really don’t know. Are you in that position—that deeply you don’t know?

Q4: Aren’t we creating a problem there?

K: No, I have no problem. I don’t know—it is not a problem. I don’t know the mileage between here and Bangalore. I don’t know.

Q4: Starting with a very clean slate.

K: You see what you have reduced it to? A definition, right? So you are going to be caught in it. I really don’t know what to do with this. When I say I don’t know, I mean I am not expecting an answer. So I am not looking for an answer, I am not trying to avoid it; it’s there. And I don’t know what to do with it.

Q4: To me, it appears to be a terrific state of restlessness if I don’t know what to do.

K: Why? You don’t know what to do. Why should you become restless?

Q4: The mind is conditioned to that.

K: I am sorry. I don’t know the distance from here to Delhi, I don’t know; why should I become restless and fuss around? I don’t know.

RT: How do we communicate it to the child?

K: I am not communicating. I am not communicating anything to the children yet. I don't know what to do with this. Are you like that?

PNS: Yes.

K: No. Don't deceive yourselves. I completely don't know what to do with this. It is not a problem. From the bottom of myself I refuse to have problems in my life. If they arise I'll deal with them, but I refuse to have problems. So this is not a problem to me, and I don't know how to deal with it. Which is not a contradiction, you follow?

PNS: Yes.

K: It is not a contradiction—I don't know. Move from there.

AK: What will happen if I call it a problem in the sense that I'm just identifying an area? I call it a problem. It's just an area that I don't know, and I call it a problem.

K: No, sir. Why do you reduce it to an area and all that? I have a problem because I quarrel with him. It is a problem and I ask, 'By Jove, how am I to get rid of this quarrel?' If I like to quarrel with him and he likes to quarrel with me, that's a different matter, but I don't want to quarrel with him. But I'm constantly quarrelling with him. And I say, 'My God, that has become a problem, a neurosis', blah, blah, blah, and I do all kinds of things.

RT: You have said that making something into a problem, and facing the facts for what they are, are two different things. So if you don't bring yourself into it, then the facts are placed in the right perspective, and that helps to resolve it.

K: No. You refuse to have problems, right? *Never* have problems.

RT: That's right, but the very fact...

K: Not 'right'. Refuse to have problems in your school.

RT: But then there are facts which will...

K: Wait, wait. There are problems. This is a fact: I am a bundle, he is a bundle.

RT: And the two bundles collide because of selfish interests.

K: Therefore we create a problem. And I say, 'Sorry, they may collide, they may do anything they like, but it's not a problem to me.' Go to the very end of it, don't stop in the middle of it. It may be the school, clashing opinions, each

person sticking to his own; you know all the rest of it. You make a problem of it, right?

RT: That's because you consider what you feel about it is very important.

K: Yes, or what he feels about it is important. Which is another form of bundle.

Q5: Doesn't it mean that you are unable to look because of the bundle?

K: Yes. You are not looking at the facts. These are facts, but you are not looking at them because you have problems. Because you make it into a problem. But when you do look at it you say, 'By Jove, I really don't know how to answer this.' So I ask: does your mind, heart, say, 'I really don't know what to do'? Don't make *that* into a problem. So what is the quality of a mind that says, 'I won't look at life as a problem'?

RT: We must be free to look at the facts.

K: Can you look at something and not make it into a problem? This is something that you have to find out, not I tell you. To have a mind that refuses to have problems. But it has to act, right? You can't say, 'Well, I've no problem' and vegetate, but you have to do something about it.

KJ: There has to be a response.

K: There has to be a response or action from a mind that refuses to have problems. Is your mind like that? See, we have made life into a problem; earning money, loving, being kind, everything is a problem to us. Why should a student passing examinations make it into a problem? See what happens. You know, I was just reading the other day that in Japan students have become neurotic about going to schools; they commit suicide. Teachers have become bullies, and the children are frightened. I am not saying your teachers are bullies.

So is your mind free from making problems? I have a wife who doesn't want to live with me or who says, 'I am going off to Mexico, you come with me.' And I say, 'Sorry, I'd like to, darling, but I can't because I am this.' And so this becomes an enormous problem. If I have no problem, what shall I do? I *refuse* to make that into a problem. I don't *treat* it as a problem. The very word is wrong to me. The very root meaning of that word *problem* is 'something thrown at you, hurled at you, a challenge'. I refuse to have anything thrown at me. But I have a wife who wants to live in Mexico, and I don't want to. What shall I do?

PNS: Go to Mexico.

K: Go with her to Mexico? [*Laughter*]

RD: I want to ask you a question. You suddenly discover yourself as a being who has this tendency to make problems. You know it, you don't know why, but you do make problems. And if there is someone who comes and says very logically, 'Don't make problems', and shows the whole nature of it, you seem to have seen it with whatever capacities you have. And yet you find the problem-making still continues. Maybe it reduces, maybe you perceive something, but it continues, its essential nature continues. What would you do?

K: I won't have that problem.

RD: No, but what would you do?

K: I'm not going to be trapped.

RD: Krishnaji, I am listening to you, please.

K: Yes, I know. But I am not going to be trapped by this. I said very carefully, 'I don't know.' But it's not a problem—it's not 'I don't know, how am I to?'—I really don't know what to do with this.

RD: But what will you do?

Q3: But that is exactly what most of us are unable to say.

K: Yes, sir, that's the difficulty. It's very interesting this, it's terribly revealing. The moment you say 'to look without'...

PNS: ...that becomes another problem.

K: Got it?

Q4: Yes, sir.

K: I can tell you what to do, but I am not going to tell you. Just see for yourself: the mind has been trained, educated, conditioned to create problems and resolve problems. I've a problem in science, physics, and I study it, go into it, learn all about it, resolve it, and invent something out of it. My mind is trained. It has taken me twenty years or fifteen years or ten years to be a good doctor. I've been conditioned, educated, moulded to create problems and resolve those problems.

Q3: I have a question: have we ever resolved any problem? Or we only try to resolve?

K: They have resolved problems—by inventing another, bigger problem. They have resolved the question of war by inventing the atom bomb; it has become

another problem. So if you don't resolve, if you don't have problems, then there is nothing to...

Now come back: Is your mind very clear about not having problems, not making a single thing into a problem? Except the mechanical problems—the car or the telephone or something or the other goes wrong; it is a problem. But inwardly I am not going to make anything into a problem, even quarrelling with my wife or husband. Are *you* like that? Tell me, sir, are you like that?

Q3: I don't know.

K: Are you saying you don't really know?

PNS: I am like that.

K: What?

PNS: I create problems.

K: Then, creating problems, you make another problem by saying, 'How am I not to create problems?' See this stupid game we play? But you see the logic of it, step by step, how problems are created, how we resolve them. You see all that, and yet you make problems. Somebody says, 'Don't walk there, there is a big hole, you will drop into it.' But you keep on walking; what is the matter with you? Blind? Or you want to commit suicide? Or you are indifferent, you just walk around, drop into a precipice? You follow what I'm saying? Somebody says to you, 'You don't have to', and he explains most minutely.

PNS: I must have the same intensity as that person.

K: No! I have no intensity in this. I express it intensely, but it's not intensive in assertion. Step by step we've gone into it. At the end of it you say, 'I still have problems.'

PNS: I didn't say I still have problems. I don't know what I'll do.

K: I am not asking you what you'll do. I'm just asking you, is your mind making problems?

PNS: Not here.

K: Of course, not here. Because I am preventing you. [*Laughter*] So if you leave this room and nobody's preventing you, you fall back into it. Which means what? Going blindly. You see the danger, and you keep on walking towards it.

PNS: You're not really concerned.

K: No, no. Be simple. You see a great big hole, a crevice, out of which you cannot get out. Then you keep on walking towards it; what's wrong with you?

PNS: You're addicted to it.

K: No. What is wrong with you? There is a sign which says 'Dangerous' and you read it carefully and you walk. Which means what? You never read the sign?

PNS: Yes, I read the sign.

K: But you never read it. What's the matter with you, old boy? You read the sign that says 'Danger, most dangerous, don't go in that direction'. You read it and go on. If I did that, what would you call me? What would you call me if I read this sign 'Most dangerous', dangerous in the sense you will kill yourself, and go on? What would you call me if I did that?

RH: Blind.

PNS: Mad.

K: You all use such strange words. What would you call me? You would call me an idiot, right? I drop into a hole like that, so something is wrong with me. So is something wrong with you when you say, 'I see the danger of having problems', and still go on walking into that?

Madras, 7 January 1983

6

Don’t Make a Problem of Anything in Life

Are we aware that we are trained to solve problems?—Moving away from this tendency—Are you approaching a human problem as a professional?—Envy and the machinery that makes it a problem—Stopping the machinery which creates the problem—It can stop only when you realize that it is a problem-solving machinery—The machinery is the real trouble, not the fact—The feeling of not making anything in life into a problem—When the machinery ends, the mind undergoes a tremendous change.

Q1: Yesterday we were discussing the question of where we lay our emphasis—on the human being or on the profession. It was quite clear to us that the professional approach is the problem-solving approach, which divides action as problem and solution, whereas the human approach is not that.

Krishnamurti (K): Are you quite sure we said that the human approach is not that?

Q1: Yes.

K: Or did we say that our brains, our minds—whichever word you would like to use for the moment—are conditioned to solving problems? Our brains and minds are trained to solve problems in computers, engineering, and so on. If I am an engineer I have a problem, so the thing is conditioned. We said the same approach is carried over to psychological problems; that is, the brain and the mind are conditioned to solving problems, and we approach our human problems with the same mentality. That is what we said yesterday. And why do we make anything into a problem? Why? We went into that: why do we make problems?

Q1: The ‘why’ is quite clear: it has become a habit, that is the way we have lived all along.

K: This morning P and I talked for ten minutes, and we saw certain things. In my mind it was not a problem. I made certain things very clear, and it was not a problem—to me, at least. And I hope she agreed to my saying that it is not a problem to me. Now, why do we make any issue into a problem? We said yesterday that a human being is a bundle of various characteristics, idiosyncrasies, beliefs, and all that, and the student also is a bundle. You understand the word *bundle*? Human beings are bundles of various factors, intellectual, emotional, sensory, ideational—grief, pain, sorrow, pleasure, fear, various categories of conditioning, and so on. So is the student. And as human beings first—not as teachers, that comes later—we are concerned with bringing

about a different kind of human being, a good human being. We discussed a little bit what the good is. So there are these three issues: I am a bundle put together, the student is a bundle, and the feeling that we must bring about good human beings.

Why do we make that into a problem? How to do it, who will tell us what to do, how to get over this fragmentation of oneself—all that becomes a problem. Please correct me if I am wrong. So far am I right about what we discussed yesterday? And seeing this we make it into a problem, and then the mind, which is trained or educated to resolving problems, approaches the issue and says, 'It is a problem, we must solve it.' And, as we said, why do we do this? Why do we create a problem out of this? I am fragmented, the student is fragmented, we want good human beings—why do we make that into a problem? The moment you make it into a problem, then the mind approaches it with that attitude. But the thing remains, the thing is there to be resolved, but if you approach it with a mind that is trained to solving problems, then you make it into a problem. I said, 'Don't make it into a problem.' That is where we were yesterday, weren't we? Now proceed, sirs.

Why do I make this into a problem, or is there a different approach to this thing altogether? Computers bring about a great many problems, and the mind is capable there because it is trained to resolve those problems. But it is not like that here. So could we approach this differently, not making it into a problem?—which is, I am fragmented, I am a bundle, the student is a bundle, and also there is in one the deep feeling that there must be good human beings. Can we approach it not as a problem? What shall we do? If I don't treat it as a problem—and I personally don't want to treat anything as a problem—I watch it and let it move. There are these three issues, and is it possible to look at them without the problem-solving mind, the mind that has been trained to solve problems? Personally, I don't consider this a problem; it is so. I am fragmented, the student also is, and there is the idea—not the idea—the feeling that there must be good human beings. How do you regard this?

SP: Does the difference lie only in the word *problem* and the quality of the problem-making mind? So long as it remains, the situation is going to be there.

K: I don't quite follow.

SP: You are objecting to the word *problem*.

K: We explained that, we went into it. The root meaning, the etymological meaning, of the word *problem* is 'something thrown at you'.

SP: Life is all the time throwing things at you.

K: I question that.

SF: Could we examine the process by which we turn a situation into a problem?

K: We went into all that yesterday.

SF: We didn't actually go into it very deeply because there is involved in that process the desire to change the situation.

K: We went into that yesterday, if you don't mind. We asked: are we first aware that we are doing this, that we are trained to solve problems? That is the process we have been conditioned to. And when you look at these three[1], you come to it with that conditioning and treat it as a problem. I say, 'Please don't treat it as a problem.' If you don't treat it as a problem, then what takes place? You understand what I mean? What takes place?

Q2: Can't we begin by going into the facts?

K: We went into the fact—I am a fragmented human being, a bundle of various things, high, low, moral, immoral, contradictory, aspiring for something noble, and so on. And the boy is also that. So what am I to do? It is there, and I am not approaching it as a problem. I *refuse* to make it into a problem.

KJ: Is it possible for me to say this is a bundle, that is a bundle, and I want the child to be a good human being? The moment I say I want the child to be good, I have made it into a problem.

K: Yes, we more or less agreed to that, didn't we? We see we have to build a house, a good house. We see what the world is, how everything is breaking up; out of that observation we see how human beings make everything destructive. So we say, 'I hope there will be somebody who'... all the rest of it. It's not an idea, it's not a wish, it's not a conclusion. For me it's not; it may be to you or to the others. My question is: If you don't approach this question with a mind that thinks in problems, what is your action about this?

Q3: There is one question about emotional problems.

K: Please don't use the word *problem*. They are there.

Q2: Is that the reason why we see the situation as a problem?

K: Why do you see it as a problem?

Q2: Because of the emotional bundles within us.

K: Because of the emotional bundles? That's part of your conditioning or part of the mind that has been trained to approach any emotion as a problem. So could

[1] The three issues he mentions earlier, in paragraph 6: 'So there are these three issues: I am a bundle put together, the student is a bundle, and the feeling that we must bring about good human beings.'

we move away from this tendency of making everything into a problem? Could we? If you do, then what happens? How do we deal with this question?

Q4: I have a very faint glimpse as to...

K: Yes sir, yes sir. I am sure. Go on.

Q4: ...how to grow in that.

K: Penetrate it, examine it, investigate it, not as a problem. That's all I am trying to say.

Q5: When I approach any question or any issue without making it into a problem, then there is a closer contact between me and the question.

K: Are you in closer contact with what we described as the three, the triangle? When you approach it very closely what do you do, how do you act?

Q5: I don't act. The question itself shows me how to do it. I am not operating on the question or the issue, but the issue itself unfolds, opens the door of suggestion.

K: So how has it unfolded to you? If you forgive me for repeating what we said yesterday, and if it is not too boring: are you very clear that you are not approaching this question with a mind that is trained to solve problems? Are you quite clear on that? You have a problem in science, and you know that it can be solved because you have studied books, you have spent years on it, and so on. So your whole outlook with regard to that is of a problem-solving mind. This being a human problem, are you approaching the human problem as a professional? How do you look at it if you are not approaching this question mechanically?—mechanically in the sense that a mind trained along a particular line, as an engineer, repeats itself. Its repetition may be wide, may be short, may be long, but it is still in the same movement. Are you approaching this with the same mind?

Q6: The tool in this field seems to be thinking, thought.

K: Yes.

Q6: So does thought have anything to do with it?

K: I am not going to tell you, find out. You are saying, are you, that the same thought that has been trained to solve problems is now operating on this? Right? Then what will you do?

HP: Anything we do will add to the problem.

K: I have no problems. You haven't understood. You are still using the word *problem*. Why do we make problems? Look, let's make it very simple, bearing in mind that the etymological meaning of the word is 'something thrown at you'. A problem is a challenge, right? And I know how to meet problems because I have solved mathematical problems and so on. I can tackle them. I take years and years to learn and go on that way. Do you approach *this* question with that same momentum? Apparently you do. I am not criticizing you; I wouldn't, it is not my business to criticize you. But I'm just asking, do you approach this with the same movement?

Q3: If we don't approach it that way, it is no longer something thrown at us.

K: This is thrown at you: I am a bundle and you all are; that's a fact. You, my teacher, are a bundle; so am I, your student; it is so. Nothing is thrown at you, it is so.

Q3: We are just in the situation.

K: It is so. Is a fact a problem? Look, it is a fact that I am a bundle.

Q3: But you may not like it.

K: I know. This has nothing to do with like or dislike, but it is a fact. My hair is semi-white, it is a fact. Right? If it is a fact, why do I make it into a problem? I make it into a problem when I don't like the fact, or want to get rid of it, or want to change it. Now, can a fact be changed into another fact? That's what your trouble is.

PNS: Maybe not, maybe yes.

K: You think it out, old boy. It is a fact that you and I, you as the teacher and I as your pupil, are bundles. That is a fact. Now, why do you make it into a problem?

PNS: I do not.

K: Ah no, no. Careful. Why do I make it into a problem? It is a fact.

PNS: Because I want to solve it, I make it into a problem.

K: Or change it.

PNS: Yes.

K: This is a fact—it's a microphone.

Q2: Are you trying to say that we have to accept anything as a fact?

K: I didn’t say that. I said I am a bundle, he is a bundle, which is a fact. That is a white wall.

SP: Normally, what happens is that you try to change it if you don’t like it. So I say, ‘Look, they are all problems, the same movement of the same mind.’

K: Are you saying it more as a mental conclusion?

SP: I see it as a fact that there is the pressure to solve something; you have to investigate it.

K: I have no pressure.

SP: *You* have no pressure.

K: No. Why have you? Why have you the pressure?

SP: Because the fact remains that I am fragmented. The fact remains that the children are a bundle and I am a bundle. I see that any attempt to change it is again the extension of the same thing. I see that, and yet the fact remains.

K: No. I didn’t say ‘the same thing’.

SP: What did you say?

K: I said I am a bundle, that is a fact. I am asking, why do make a problem of it?

HP: But this bundle itself creates a problem.

K: No, sir.

HP: It is a bundle of what?

K: Haven’t you been listening the whole of yesterday?

HP: Yes. If it is a bundle of emotions and thoughts, these thoughts collide with each other and create problems.

K: Why should they collide with each other? They may, but why do I make it a problem? They collide: I want to be rich, and I want to be a *sannyasi* at the same time. They collide, that is a fact. I think I am a great man, but I am really a rather shoddy little man; that is a fact. Why do I make a problem of it? You see, you haven’t got the root of it.

Q1: I want to ask you why I want to change it.

K: No, no. You haven't really put your teeth into the question of not creating problems. I don't want to have problems in my life; I don't. You understand? And I really mean it: I don't want to have problems. And I am not going to make anything into a problem.

Q2: The moment you say 'I don't want to', that is a sort of mental conclusion.

K: Ah no, no. Please, I made this very clear yesterday. When I use the word *don't*, I see the uselessness of having problems, the wastage of energy.

PJ: May I ask a question? A fragmented mind, has it any other way of operating but the way of problem-making?

K: I say there is.

PJ: Now, this is crucial.

K: Even a fragmented mind, even a fragmented bundle...

PJ: This is the crucial problem.

K: Yes, yes.

PJ: Is there another way for the fragmented mind, another way of looking?

K: Yes, yes. I am looking only at the fact—you are no longer in Bangalore, that is a fact.

PJ: Yes. But you don't look at an emotional fact like that.

K: Wait. I quarrel with my wife, that is a fact. But when I say, 'I mustn't quarrel with my wife', 'Why do we quarrel, darling?' and all the rest of it, then it becomes a problem. And I am saying this is the whole process of our living. Are you quite sure you see this?

PNS: Yes.

PJ: We can't see it.

K: You two fight it out. [*Laughter*]

PJ: How can you leave it there? I am envious, it is a fact.

K: That's all.

PJ: That's not all, sir.

K: I know. Very well. First, don't make envy into a problem. It is a fact, right?

PJ: You say, 'Don't make anything into a problem.' I understand that. Either the machinery within me ends, in which case only the problem exists. As long as the machinery within me is operating, it *must be* a problem.

K: We went into that very carefully yesterday. The machinery is my mind—we will use the *mind* for the moment. My mind is trained as a machine to solve problems; it has been trained, conditioned, educated in that direction.

PJ: It is nothing else?

K: Wait, wait. So I look at everything in my life as a problem to be resolved. All my life is a blasted problem—living, dying, loving, sex—everything becomes a problem. Now I said, 'Why do we make these things into a problem?' I ask that. What is your answer?

Q1: It is an affirmation of myself. Problem-solving affirms myself.

K: Which means what? That yourself is a problem-solving machinery. Oh, for God's sake!

PNS: Before seeing the fact as it is, before you can see it, you take it as a problem and start.

K: Yes, that's all. So can you look at the fact—these three? I am not including everything else. Can we look at these three? Which is, you are a teacher, you are a bundle with all the emotions; I am a student, another bundle; and there's the other thing: the good. Can you look at them as facts and not bring in all the machinery of saying, 'I must solve this damn thing'? I am indifferent, careless, *laissez-aller*; that is a fact. And I see you caring very much, very clear, very definite, very efficient, and I say, 'By Jove, why am I not?'

PNS: Will you say that? If you are indifferent and you don't care, then you won't see me at all.

K: Oh yes, I see it. My dear chap, don't tell me such silly things. Of course I see it. You drive a car better than I do. I get into your car, and you drive better than I do.

PNS: I would just say that you can drive better and leave it there.

K: No. Look, sir, I am envious, envy being measure, envy being comparison. Now, the whole machinery of wanting to change it and make it into a problem is in operation, and therefore I am trying to do something about this envy, and my brain has been trained for years.

PNS: Yes.

K: Right? So I make envy into a problem. Now, can I stop the machinery which creates the problem and just face the fact that I am envious? Come to that, then we can discuss what happens. But if you don't come to that, we can't discuss. This seems so logical, sane; what's the difficulty?

PJ: Can the machinery stop?

K: We are going to find out. Can this machinery stop? You understand her question? What do you say?

PNS: Before that I want to tell you something: I am envious of you now.

K: You are?

PNS: Yes. Then when my envy is revealed on my face, I want to conceal it because I won't like to show it to you.

K: Of course not.

PNS: So what happens? That itself is an action of not looking at it, so I have to reveal my envy to you.

K: Yes, that's all. You have understood? I am envious of you and I show it, and I suddenly realize the whole machinery is in operation. Now, P asked a question: can this machinery stop?

Q3: What about an outsider who is watching this machinery of envy and jealousy?

K: It is not an outsider. Your mind is trained that way. That is a fact, isn't it? Your mind is trained, educated to resolving problems. You accept that?

Q3: I accept that.

K: Then can you stop that machinery? Don't ask, 'Who is to stop it?' Don't make a problem of it. You see that?

Q3: Should we see only that?

K: Wait a minute, let's go into that. I am the machinery which has been trained to solve problems, all my life till I die—chess problems, mechanical problems, mathematical problems. Now I ask myself, can it stop? If I say it must stop, I make a problem of it. Then I will say, 'How am I to stop it?' I use my will and so on. And I realize that I am making a problem of it—the stopping.

P asked a very good question, as we asked yesterday: ‘Can we stop the machinery?’ And not make it into a problem?

Q5: P asked, ‘Can the machinery stop?’ Not ‘Can envy stop?’

K: Yes. I am coming to that. I am concerned only with the stopping of the machinery. And I say I am not going to make a problem of it—how, why, suppress it, run away from it, transcend it, or go to a guru or people like you who tell me how to stop it. Without doing all that, which will create a problem, I am looking at the machinery in operation. So there is the realization that the brain, the mind, is trained to solve problems; that is a fact.

Q1: That struggle is a fact.

K: That’s a fact.

PJ: But you see, there is the problem of ending.

K: I am not ending it.

PJ: There is envy. The moment you turn from trying to solve the problem of envy to an observing of the movement of the machinery...

K: That’s a fact.

PJ: It’s a fact, but see the change which has taken place. The perception...

K: No, no, don’t use the word *perception*. It only complicates it, you see.

PJ: An emotion rises in me, which the mind immediately registers as envy. Now, the next thing that usually happens is: how am I to be free of it? Which is the problem-making.

K: Yes, the problem-making.

PJ: It will arise, that question.

K: Of course. We have gone through that.

PJ: The observing of that arising is the observing of that machinery.

K: So the observation of the fact that I am envious makes me observe also the machinery in operation. Which is, both are facts.

PJ: Both are facts.

K: Just wait a minute, stop there. Both are facts, right? What shall I do? Go on. Is the sun rising and the sun setting a problem?

PNS: No, it's a fact. You can't do anything about it.

K: You have just realized it? Wait, you are missing something.

PJ: May I say something? The very observing of the machinery, the action which arises in that state of observing the machinery, is an action which is neither trying to change nor has created a problem. I don't know whether I am able to communicate all this.

K: You are making it a bit difficult, if I may point out. I want to keep it as simple as possible. You are envious, that is a fact. Is your mind trying to resolve the fact?

PNS: No, I am not trying to resolve the fact.

K: If it is not, the machinery is not in operation.

PNS: Yes.

K: Wait, just go slowly. I complicate the damn thing so much, I don't want to do it. You are envious of me, of another; you know the implications of all that. Are you aware that your machinery is now going to take charge of that?

PNS: Yes.

K: So you are making a problem of it.

PNS: Yes.

K: Why?

PNS: Because I am not able to see envy as it is revealed.

K: No! You are envious of X, and the machinery which you have been living with comes over and takes charge of it and then makes a problem of it. Are you aware of this movement, just that?

PNS: Yes.

K: Right? Now, that movement is a fact. Leave envy alone for the moment.

PNS: That movement is important.

K: That movement, which is trained, educated to solving problems, is in operation when you see the fact. Right? Now next question: can that machinery stop? It can stop naturally only when you realize that the machinery is a problem-solving machinery and you are then avoiding the fact.

PNS: Yes.

K: You get the point? Are you quite clear? Look, sir, you are envious. You know what envy is—measurement, comparison, and so on. And are you aware of the momentum, the movement of a mind that is always thinking of life as a problem? And you make this into a problem.

PNS: Yes.

K: Right? Are you aware that this movement is a fact?

PNS: Yes.

K: That is a fact. Now, can you look at that fact without creating...

PNS: ...another problem?

K: Another problem. Just fact, right?

PNS: I have done it several times, but it goes on.

K: No, you haven't done it. Have you looked at it as a fact? Like the electricity going through these wires is a fact.

PNS: Yes.

K: So this movement is a fact, and envy is a fact. But you want to stop this machinery, and that becomes a problem.

PNS: Yes. Even more than envy.

K: So you have two problems. And life creates a dozen problems that way. Now I ask: Is there a possibility of this momentum coming to an end—the momentum being you have been trained and all that—without making it a problem?

PNS: Yes.

K: Which means what?

PNS: To look at the momentum.

K: You have looked at it.

Q3: The moment I look at it, it ceases to exist.

K: Has it ceased with you?

Q3: No.

K: Don't say these things if you don't mean it.

Q1: When you become aware of it, the machinery does come to a halt, but then you get into a state where you don't know, and you quickly jump back to...

K: Why do you? We went into it yesterday. There is a sign that says, 'This leads to a great precipice, a great hole, be careful, don't come near it.' You read the sign and keep on walking towards that danger. Why do you do it?

PNS: Because you do not know, you think this is the only route.

K: But the man points out that there is danger to life, don't go.

PNS: You think that's the more risky road.

K: Which? This?

PNS: No, the other road which the man points out.

K: Are you all nutty? What is the matter with you? If you don't bring in that momentum, then you can look at the facts and see what happens. You don't do that.

PNS: I am not sure; we can't say we don't do that.

K: I am saying my mind has been trained, educated, conditioned—whatever word you like to use—to resolving problems; that's a fact. Now, can I look at that fact without trying to end it, stop it, escape from it, suppress it, all the rest of it? Look at it. Not who looks, why he looks, and all the rest. Just look at it, can you?

PNS: Yes.

K: Of course you can.

PNS: Like we look at the sunset, sunrise.

K: Yes, you look at it. It is so. Then can it stop? When you look at envy, when that feeling arises, don't allow this machinery to come in. Not 'allow', you understand? I'm tired of repeating this.

PNS: Yes, it's quite clear.

K: Clear in what sense? That you are aware that the machinery is the real trouble, not the fact?

PNS: Yes. It is a bigger problem than the fact.

K: I am saying it all; what's happened to your mind? The machinery is the real trouble, not the fact. So if that is the trouble-maker, if you realize inwardly or see the fact that it is the trouble-maker, you say, 'By Jove'. It's over. But you don't realize that it is the trouble-maker. If in your office there is a trouble-maker, you talk to him and say, 'Don't make trouble.' You give him first chance, second chance, third chance, and then say, 'Old boy, out you go.' So can you look at this trouble-maker as a fact and not say, 'I must solve it, I must do something about it'? He is the real trouble-maker. Then look at envy, what happens then? That's not a problem. What do you say? Are you getting it? Not words, words, but the feeling of not making *anything* in life into a problem.

PNS: But don't you think that to see anything as a fact, you must be wanting to see it as a fact?

K: No, no! A cobra is a dangerous thing, that's a fact. You don't think you must see that cobra, go into all that circus. You see it is a dangerous thing.

PNS: But in our daily life...

K: That's what I am saying: in daily life we approach life with the machinery that says life has become a problem.

PNS: When I am dealing with you, I feel envious of you. At that time the machinery which tries to suppress it is in operation. If I then let the machinery operate...

K: ...then you have problems.

PNS: Because you are frightened of the other person. Only if you are really not frightened of anything can you watch the machinery.

K: Don't come to a conclusion. You have come to a conclusion.

PNS: Yes, I have come to a conclusion.

K: That means you have stopped thinking, stopped investigating. You have said the machinery can stop only when there is no fear.

PNS: Fear of concealing, you know.

K: Yes, fear. So you are making a problem of it: how am I to get rid of fear?

PNS: No, I am not making that a problem at all.

K: But you have stated categorically, come to a conclusion that you must...

PNS: Because I have seen it in myself that when I have fear...

K: You are sticking to something. Move away from fear.

PNS: Suppose I am frightened of you.

K: You are not frightened of me.

PNS: I am not frightened, but suppose I am frightened.

K: Ah, no. I don't suppose. Why should I suppose? That's not a fact. Supposition is not a fact. What is a fact is that you are envious.

PNS: Yes.

K: If you are, don't make a problem of it. Which means, don't let the machinery take charge of it. And when the machinery takes charge of it, you have problems because that is used to problems. If you see that clearly, the machinery comes to an end. As factual as the sun rising in the east and setting in the west. Are you clear on this?

PNS: Very clear.

K: Then how do you deal with envy—not as a problem?

PNS: Let it operate.

K: You see, you are already coming to a conclusion. Which means, when you come to a conclusion, that ends the matter, that way you have closed the door. But if you don't close the door and say, 'By Jove, I see the truth that I mustn't'—you follow? It is absurd to close the door. Then what happens to envy?

I want to marry somebody, and I have realized that I mustn't make a problem of it because I have heard this morning very clearly what you are talking about, and I see that the moment I bring the machinery into operation about my marriage, it becomes a problem. So I am not going to make it a problem. But I

want to marry, but the woman whom I want to marry doesn't want to marry me; that is a fact. And I want to marry her, that is a fact.

PNS: It is not a problem.

K: No? [*Laughs*] What do you mean?

PNS: I don't want to marry her, that's all. I see the fact.

K: Is it as simple as that, old boy?

PNS: Yes, sir. Very simple.

K: Have you come across anybody whom you wanted to marry with all your heart?

PNS: Yes, I have. [*Laughter*]

K: Good. Did you make a problem of it?

PNS: Initially, but...

K: Ah, ah. You see, these fellows don't think it out. I want to marry that woman, she doesn't want to marry; both are facts. I want her, I want to marry her, I want to live with her, I want sex with her, I want children by her; all my glands are in operation. Right? Do I make it into a problem? I have listened to all this, this morning and yesterday, and I see that the machinery creates the problem. So I have understood it, therefore it is over for me. But the fact remains.

PNS: To me it is not a problem.

K: Is it as simple as that, old boy?

PNS: Yes.

K: So I say, 'Good-bye, old girl, thank you so much', and go off?

PNS: Yes.

K: Look, I am in love with you. You can't say good-bye and go off. I want you, it is my tremendous urge, biological and everything. And I know I am not going to make a problem of it. See what happens, sir. You are not facing it. I am cruel, thoughtless, disorganized, and you are. That is, both are facts. And I see the futility of the machinery coming in here. I really see it—it's not just words—out it goes; that machinery has stopped functioning altogether. That is where your difficulty is, right? It hasn't stopped. [*Pause*]

There are many issues you are all going to face in Rishi Valley. The thing has to be turned upside down—not upside down totally; something has to happen there. Change it fundamentally, not let it be mediocre and so on. I am talking about it to all. If I make it into a problem, I will never end it: there will be problem after problem, problem after problem. As long as that machinery is in operation, Rishi Valley will have dozens and dozens of problems. That machinery creates problems, it is treacherous, dangerous. I say I won't touch it. I won't touch a cobra.

Q5: Krishnaji, do you mean that even the physical problems of Rishi Valley can't be solved by this machinery?

K: There are physical problems—nutrition in the kitchen, better food—but if you make a problem of better food...

PNS: A stone in the middle of the road is a physical problem; take it and keep it aside.

K: Put it aside. What are you talking about? You need more water...

PNS: Get more water.

K: Drill for it, if you have the money. If you don't have money, don't plant trees. If you want to mend the road, mend it; if you can't, put sand on it, mud on it, whatever it is, and get on with it. All that we are saying is: *Don't make a problem of anything in life*. I wonder if you have got this in your blood? [*Pause*]

Now, I have these situations at Rishi Valley; there are facts there. I am not introducing problems into that. Please, once and for all let's be very clear that the moment you introduce the machinery, you are going to create problems; Rishi Valley will be full of problems. And you have stopped the machinery because it is the problem; it is the creator of problems, not the facts.

PNS: Yes. It creates problems by itself; the nature of it is to create problems.

K: That's all. If that is absolutely, irrevocably clear...

PNS: It is not just a problem-solving machinery, but also a problem-creating machinery.

K: That's right. Got it?

PNS: Yes.

K: Are you quite sure? In your blood?

PNS: I am sceptical.

K: Ah, no. How can you be sceptical about a cobra? You are not sceptical about a cobra, are you?

PNS: If I don't have the knowledge of it...

K: ...you go and look at it. You look at it and you know it by its markings; you have seen cobras. If you see that the machinery is the most dangerous thing, you don't touch it. Are you clear on this point?

PNS: Yes.

K: If you are absolutely clear, then you are dealing only with facts. Then deal with the fact. You and I are both a bundle of this; what happens if the machinery is thrown out of the window? What happens?

PNS: Only that problem remains, only that bundle remains.

K: Why do you use the word *problem*?

PNS: Sorry.

K: Just look at it, sir. There is only the fact. I am a bundle; you, my teacher, are a bundle. Take your own problem of envy: I am envious of you because you are tall, I am short; you are beautiful, I am ugly; you are clever, I am not; you have got depth, I have not, and so on and so on. I am envious of you, and the machinery is gone forever. I can't pick it up tomorrow. It's gone, blown to smithereens, vaporized—any word you like. Now, what then?

KY: The fact, whatever it is, will reveal its nature.

K: The fact is that I am envious. Don't move away. I am envious, that is a fact. And the machinery is gone, finished, gone to Moscow. What do you do, what happens when the machinery is gone?

KY: Envy reveals itself.

K: Yes, I know what it means. What happens? It is a living poison, right?

Q1: You work on the fact.

K: Who is to work on it? You are back again. Which shows that you really are not free of the machinery. What am I to do? Live with it? Die with it? Carry envy for the rest of my life? What do you say, sir? So I come back to that.

Q5: When you ask, 'Shall I live with it, die with it, put up with it?' are you condemning envy?

K: No, sir.

PJ: The question is: are *you* condemning it? Ask yourself: what are you doing with the fact?

Q5: No. The machinery has ended, but I don't know what is taking place.

PJ: If the machinery has ended, how can you say that you don't know what is taking place?

Q5: I am envious.

PJ: You mean to say that the machinery is ended and envy is there?

Q5: Yes.

K: Are you quite sure?

Q5: Yes.

K: Wait sir, wait sir. This is not just a plaything. Are you quite sure the machinery doesn't exist?

Q5: At this given moment.

K: Ah, no. That's our difficulty: we have never seen the fact that the brain, which has been trained, is the real trouble-maker, not the fact. I can go into what happens, but then it is just playing with words, and I am fed up with that kind of stuff. So I ask, have you dropped it? I have to find out. You are one of my students, and I am asking you. After several years of study with K, he says, 'Have you ended this ugly machinery or not?' Have you? You test those poor boys by setting examination papers, and this is your examination paper; you can't just keep quiet. Now answer me. Doesn't matter if you fail, but keep on.

Have you ended it? Is the machinery broken up? It doesn't function anymore—is it so? Never! You can't catch it, put it together; it is all gone, vaporized by an atom bomb. Then the fact remains, which is envy. What then? Don't you see what has happened? When that machinery has stopped, broken up, vaporized, gone, what has happened to you, what has happened to your mind?

PNS: It is silent.

K: No, don't be too quick, old boy. Study it a little bit, study the question first. The questioner asks: when the machinery has gone, what is there?

PNS: Nothing.

K: Don’t answer it too quickly. Look at it, meditate, think it out, look at it first.

Q2: The machinery has not gone, so we cannot look at it.

K: That’s just it. Why hasn’t it gone? You see the reason of it, the logic of it, the consequence of it, and yet it is still there. Why? And you keep on walking in the most dangerous direction in spite of all the warnings, ten warnings, that say: ‘Don’t go there, you will kill yourself.’ And you keep on going there. Are you neurotic?

Q2: Yes.

K: Ah, no. You see, then it is finished.

Q2: The momentum is there, and I just cannot stop it.

K: I never said, ‘Stop it.’ I said, ‘Do you see the logic of it? Do you actually see the logic of it, do you see the trouble it makes?’

Q2: I also see the satisfaction I get from this sort of momentum.

K: Satisfaction out of trouble? Then you are a sadist. You enjoy trouble, you enjoy the ache of troubles?

KY: The only thing one knows is this machinery.

K: So you are still with the machinery?

KY: Yes.

K: Why? After all this explanation of yesterday and today? We can go on with the explanation like you teach mathematics to a boy—repeat, repeat, repeat, till he begins to repeat, repeat, repeat. What do you say? Is the machinery still with you? I asked you a very simple question: has this machinery gone, finished, evaporated, blown to pieces? You mean to say I have to ask you and then you think about it?

HP: No, I am not thinking.

K: Ah, no. You are saying, ‘Have I got it, have I not got it?’

HP: No, I’m not.

K: Then what is it?

HP: Watching it.

K: After two days, watching?

HP: No. Every moment, almost all the time.

K: *Now*, sir. I'm asking, 'Did you listen to all the explanation, to the reason, to the logic about the danger of this machine which creates problems, so that you are free of it, it no longer exists with you?'

PNS: Seeing logically will not free you of anything.

K: All right, have you seen the fact, the truth of it—the truth?

PNS: Yes, the feeling.

K: No. The truth that it is the most dangerous thing. Like a dangerous drug. You don't take a dangerous drug unless you want to kill yourself; that's a different matter, you are welcome to it. But if you don't want to kill yourself, you don't take that drug.

PNS: But seeing the reason and logic of it will not prevent you from taking it.

K: I know, I know. You are going off. I am going to prevent you from going off. The fact is that the machinery is the most dangerous thing in human life. Do you see it as a danger and therefore it is finished?

HP: Sir, when can one say that the machinery has ended completely? How can one say that? What is the idea behind it? Not idea, but how does one get that feeling of saying that the machinery has come to an end?

K: When it doesn't interfere. When I look at something as a fact, and if there is no problem, the machinery is not there.

HP: One can say that the machinery has ended.

K: No.

HP: Almost.

K: Ah, not almost. [*Laughs*]

HP: But how can we say that?

K: I will show it to you. When we are dealing only with facts in human beings, what happens? There is no problem. Oh, for God's sake, what's the matter? I have got a tummy ache, that's a fact. I don't run away. So I ask, what causes the tummy ache? I'm eating wrong food, whatever it is, and so I don't eat it. But the

wrong food gives me delight, tastes good. Then I go on in spite of the tummy ache. So where are you? [*Long pause*]

You see, if the machinery has been blown to pieces, what has happened to my mind? Come on, tell me what has happened to my mind. What has happened to your mind? Be factual, don't invent. What happens to a mind which has been conditioned to problem-solving? When you break that, throw it away, what has happened to your mind? Actually what has happened there? What has happened *there*, not with regard to the fact?

PNS: Any explanation when it has not really happened is just intellectualizing.

K: Are you still saying it really has not happened, that your machinery has not gone?

PNS: I suppose...

K: Not suppose!

PNS: I can tell you something only if it has happened.

K: I am asking a very simple question: When you have been carrying a burden for years, and you suddenly realize that it is a useless burden and you throw it away, what happens to you, what happens to your mind?

Q1: Becomes free, becomes lighter.

K: Is your mind lighter?

PNS: It is definitely lighter.

K: Look, have you thrown away the machinery so that it never operates anymore? What has happened to your mind? I am carrying a burden weighing a lot, and I suddenly realize it and ask, 'What the dickens am I carrying this for?' And I examine the contents of that bag, of that sack, and I find it is a lot of rubbish. Which is the machinery I have carried for years. Then I say, 'By Jove, why am I doing it?' I throw it away, right? Then what has happened to my mind? My mind has now undergone a tremendous change. Then I can look at the fact. I have broken something; like a pot or a vessel I have broken it, it can't contain water anymore. Something has happened. Then with that mind that never has the machinery, the trouble-maker, I can look at the fact. The looking at that fact then is something entirely different from the old way of looking at it; that's all.

Now I can go on. You will listen, and you will say yes and carry on the next day, day after tomorrow, and repeat the same pattern. So what'll you do? Don't theorize. What'll you do? Don't say: 'Who is the "I", what to do?' What will you do? [*Long pause*]

Sir, you have given up your job; you had a lot of money from there. But you are still carrying on the machinery. What's the point of it? I am talking about the machinery, not about working in Rishi Valley. You have given up the Indian administrative service, what are you doing now? Please let's be clear. You are going to work in Bangalore or Rishi Valley; that is inevitable, that is what you want to do, but why carry the other burden? If you carry the old burden, you can't create good human beings. You are silent most of the time.

RD: I have been listening to you very carefully.

K: What's the point of listening to what I am talking about?

RD: Not just listening.

K: So have you thrown it out?

RD: I don't know what you mean by *vaporized*. I really don't know whether this machinery is vaporized.

K: When an atom bomb is dropped on something, it doesn't exist, it is vaporized; you can't even find the bones. Now, I'm asking, 'Has that machinery vaporized, gone; is it finished, broken up into so many small pieces that you can't find it?'

Q2: The examples you are giving are concrete: an atom bomb, or a cobra, or the sun setting or rising. But the mind seems to be completely different; it is an abstraction, and I am unable to do anything.

K: I am not talking about your mind. Do you actually see that the machinery is the dangerous thing? It is not the mind. Think it out.

Q2: But it becomes an abstraction.

K: No, it is not an abstraction. I have a problem. I have a problem of whether I should marry this person or that person or do something else. And now I say that's a fact. It happens to be a fact that I want to marry that woman, and she doesn't want to marry me. Right? Take a problem of your own.

Q2: The problem never seems to be a complete problem. There is no hundred per cent surety when I say I want to marry someone and the other person does not want to marry me.

K: So, that's not a reality to you. What is a personal reality to you? Tell me if you want to. Why do you make such abstractions about all this?

Q2: In a sense that is the difficulty—making abstractions because it is not real.

K: You are hungry, aren't you?

Q2: Yes.

K: Hunger is a reality. Envy is there; that's a reality, isn't it?

Q2: Yes.

K: Or do you make an abstraction of it? It is there. You compare yourself with somebody else; envy is there. That's what we are talking about. It is not an abstraction. What is an abstraction? Abstraction means to abstract, to draw from a fact a conclusion; or from a fact theorize, from a fact create an idea; to abstract from this and make it into something else. 'Abstracting' juice from a fruit, right?

PNS: Abstraction is purely intellectual. Jealousy, envy are all feelings.

K: Yes. When he says, 'I am caught in abstractions', I am examining the word *abstraction*—to abstract, to withdraw, to draw away. There is the fact of envy; why do you make an abstraction of it? It is a fact; why do you make an idea, saying it is not really a fact? I have an abstraction of it, which is an idea. Unless I am misrepresenting you, I don't understand when you say 'abstraction'.

RD: It is also an idea. A thing like thought or envy is both an idea and a reality.

K: No.

RD: That is where the problem lies.

K: For God's sake!

PJ: You talked of envy as a problem and then the machinery acting on the problem.

K: Machinery creates the problem.

PJ: Machinery is the problem.

K: Of course it is.

PJ: The moment you have put the two apart, you have started with a wrong premise. The observing of the movement of machinery is the observing of the movement of the problem. The question is, do you observe this movement? There is nothing abstract in the movement. You are observing *what is*.

RD: Would you say ideation is an actuality?

K: Of course not. The word *idea* in Greek means ‘to see, to observe’. Not what we have made out of it, right?

Madras, 8 January 1983

7

Psychological Evolution is an Illusion

What is a religious mind?—The place of belief in religious life—Why do you believe in a future life, in principles, in ideals?—You never achieve the good by allowing time—A religious mind has no feeling of reward and punishment—Has a religious mind a future?—There is no such thing as evolution apart from the biological—The religious mind has no evolution—The good has no relationship to the bad—Helping the student to listen—In attention, watching is most important.

Krishnamurti (K): Shall we go on with what we were talking about yesterday, or was it rather wearisome? Can we approach it differently? What do you think is a religious mind? We discussed this question in Brockwood; I don't know what—not conclusions—we came to, but we might just as well start it here. What do you think is a religious mind? Religion, in the deeper sense of that word, has brought about a new civilization, a new culture—like Buddhism, Christianity, Islam. They all broke up, but they brought, in their way, on their call, on their way to heaven or whatever it is, a different kind of culture, which was—if I may use that word which I don't like—spiritual, and also art, literature, painting, sculpture, music, and the old Gregorian chants. (I very much like the Hebrew and Hindu chanting.) And looking at all that, I feel that there must be a religious mind, which is global, not Christian, not Hindu, not Buddhist, not Islamic. So what do you think is a religious mind? Or is this question irrelevant? Most of the younger generation don't believe in all the nonsense that's going on in the name of religion—all the puja and rituals, doing puja every morning, and worshipping some idol. People generally all over the world have thrown away all that kind of thing, and probably we too have. But man, from the ancient days, has always wanted something beyond all this. So what do you think is a religious mind?

SP: Historically and mythologically, religion has always been considered man's relationship with the unknown, and the history of religion has been the study of how man has related himself to the unknown. And the various forms of religious organizations are an expression of it. It is really a probing into the unknown, establishing a relationship with the unknown dimension.

K: Is that a religious mind—trying to establish a contact, a communication, a relationship with the unknown?

SP: I think it is a part of it—to discover it.

K: To discover it?

RH: Another part of it is to discover this relationship and to pattern one's life after that.

K: Is that a religious mind?

SP: The absence of the self has also been considered a quality.

K: Yes. Absence of the self, a concept of the unknown, and establishing a contact, a relationship with that; and to establish a relationship with that, the self must be put away and so on and so on. Is that religion?

RD: A part of it is also to find the essence of things.

K: What do you mean by that word *essence*?

RD: Man has always been aware of appearance and reality; there has always been this dichotomy, and there is an urge to find something concrete, actual. And I feel the religious mind has inquired into this.

K: Inquired into the essence, and what?

SP: Would you say that it is the probing into the nature of appearance and reality?

RD: Yes. Appearance and reality, and if there is an essence which goes beyond these appearances.

K: What do you mean by *appearance, to appear*?

PNS: Illusion and reality.

K: Now, the root meaning of that word *illusion* is to play—*ludere*. In Sanskrit too, I believe. Now, what do you mean by illusion?

RD: One believes something to be real.

K: Then you enter into the whole world of belief.

RD: Yes, but that is a part of man's life.

K: Is it? You assume that belief is a part of one's life. Why do you have beliefs? What place has belief in our daily life? The sun rises, the sun sets; that's actual, palpable, observable, feel-able, and so on. You can feel it. You don't *believe* in that; it is a fact. It is a fact that you are a man and somebody else is a woman. It is a fact that you are tall and I am short and so on. So when you talk about reality, about belief, what place has belief?

RH: Beliefs are based on fact and enable us to predict, in some respect, the future.

K: A belief enables us to predict the future. Does it? I am questioning why human beings throughout the ages have believed. I believe in God, I believe in reincarnation, I believe in a future glory, I believe India is the greatest country, I believe God knows what else. Right? So I am just asking myself, and I hope you are asking, 'Why do we have beliefs at all?' Is it a form of hope?

SP: People have talked about a religious mind, and because I am not in that state and I would like to have that state, belief comes in.

K: Of course. Have many people talked about the religious mind?

SP: At least the Buddha has talked about it, and the Upanishadic seers too have.

K: Now, if you don't mind, we are inquiring into what is a religious mind. And we are not making it into a problem, right?

AP: I think this problem of what is a religious mind has been approached in every age wherever man has risen beyond his environmental compulsions.

K: Yes, sir.

AP: He has faced this problem of what is a religious mind.

K: Yes, we are asking the same question. We are asking, what is the religious mind? And you put forward belief as one of the major factors of a religious mind. Man has put that forward. I believe that when the K Foundation in America asked for the status of a charitable religious organization, the people asked, 'Do you believe in God?' And the people who were asking for it said, 'We hardly think so' or something. They were then told that they were not religious, and the people who were in it said, 'Look, there is no God in Buddhism.' Then the others said, 'We don't know anything about Buddhism, but you can't have it.' So is belief a part of a religious mind?

RD: Aren't you putting the question too early?

K: All right, when shall I put it? [*Laughter*]

RD: I find there is belief—I am speaking for myself. Belief comes into being unknown to me, belief springs into the mind. When it comes, I don't even call it a belief. When it is there, it is real. It is when it meets something else like another belief, or when it causes pain, or when it causes contradiction that I call it a belief.

K: You make it so complicated, old boy.

RD: Why do you call it complicated?

SP: Are you talking about belief in relation to a religious mind or belief in general?

RD: Belief in general.

K: Sir, I believe I am seeing somebody this afternoon. I believe, I think I am meeting somebody. You see, personally I don't believe in anything, so I can't talk about this. So you talk.

RD: I have a brother who believes that he will be happy if he has a lot of money.

K: Yes, quite right.

RD: Somebody else believes that he will be happy if he understands what Krishnaji is talking about.

K: All right.

RD: And there is yet another person. So in different ways belief comes into being.

K: That is, I think I will be happy—why do you call it a belief? I think I'll be happy if I've lots of money.

SP: It's a hope.

K: Hope, I said that.

RD: It's a hope, there is a future in it.

K: Yes. Hope is future. Don't elaborate. So I hope that by thinking, working, I'll be a rich man. What place has belief in hope?

RD: Belief is hope. Hope is belief.

K: No. Is hope a belief? I don't know. You are splitting hairs.

RD: No, Krishnaji, let's discuss it.

K: Go ahead, I am not preventing you.

RD: While he is hoping, he also knows there is something else. It is not that he has only one hope. He has heard Krishnamurti, he has heard another person saying something contrary, saying there is no happiness in this.

K: Yes.

RD: And he asks, what is true?

K: What do you mean ‘What is true?’?

RD: What should he believe in—this or that?

K: I am questioning.

RD: Sir, you are questioning, but this is the operation of the mind.

K: What do you mean ‘the operation of the mind’? I hope to be rich, I hope to be happy, I hope to reach *nirvana*, I hope to reach something else, I hope to meet somebody who will love me, I hope somebody will teach me how to think, and so on. In the word *hope* there lies the future. Are you saying hope and belief are synonymous? Yes, synonymous in this case. Now I am asking something else: Why do you believe in God? Why do you believe in a future life? Why do you believe in principles, in ideals, whether Aristotle’s or somebody else’s or your own guru’s ideals? Why do you believe in all that? Why do you believe in a guru and give all your money, your everything to him?

Q1: Because I want to be like that.

K: Yes, that means what? Why do you believe in a future? A really important question, go into it deeply.

RD: I would like to ask: why do I believe at all? You have put that question.

K: That’s what I am asking, sir.

RD: It’s very difficult to ask this question.

K: I am asking.

RD: You are asking, but I am saying something for myself. You asked this question, and I find that the brain is so soaked in belief, so deeply entrenched in time, that to really ask this question itself is difficult.

K: No, no. Do you believe in anything? Don’t take X, Y, Z. Do you believe in something, belief being hope?

RD: Yes, I do.

K: Yes, you hope. Which means what? You hope to create a school.

RD: Yes.

K: You hope to bring about etc., etc. What do you mean by that word *hope*? Hope implies, doesn't it, a future. You have a future, a distance from now. I hope to bring about a marvellous, unique school with children who are good. They are not so now, but I hope they will be at a certain date. That is in the future. There is an interval of time, interval of space. Right?

RD: If you will, we won't discuss this particular hope about the school. I feel it will be very good if you could discuss the deepest hope operating in us, which is: I agree with all these things Krishnaji is talking about hope; I don't fully understand it now, but one day...

K: ...I will.

RD: ...I will fully understand what he says.

K: Yes, the same thing.

RD: Yes, let's discuss it. It will be more real to me.

K: Just a minute, sir. It is exactly the same thing as a school, right? I don't understand now, but I hope to understand sometime later. The school is not good now, but we hope to make it so in the future. That is, you start from what is taking place now and hope to achieve that. So there is an interval of time.

RD: You are right.

K: Just go into it, I'm not right or wrong. There is an interval; from here to there is an interval. In that interval all other factors enter. All other factors—accidents, pressures, various forms of distractions, conclusions—all kinds of events take place between now and the future hope, so you never come to the end of it. You never achieve the good by allowing time; that's all I'm saying.

SP: Does one achieve the good immediately?

K: No, no. You see, that is a wrong question. I have to go from here to the station or to the airport; I might have an accident, I might be held up, or the tyre may blow out, or somebody may hold me up, and so on. When you allow space between now and the future, which is hope, there will be various activities interfering with, accelerating, or detracting from, the movement towards that. Not that it must happen immediately. First I see that where there is hope, where

there is an ideal, where there is a principle or a goal towards which I am working, there are innumerable influences, pressures operating, which are always detracting. I waste my energy in all that. So I say to myself, why have I hope? Dante, the great Italian poet, said, 'Abandon hope all ye who enter here', which meant hell, inferno. We are not using the word *hope* in that sense. It is not that when you give up hope there is despair; I am not talking about that. So let's go into this. Why do you have hope? I hope my son will be a great man, I hope my son will become the prime minister of this country, a rich man, and so on. Why do I have hope? What place has hope in my relationship with my son? Come on, discuss with me.

KY: Hope in this context is the same as ideals.

K: Yes, ideals. He said that.

KY: You asked why we have ideals at all.

K: No. First I want to know why we have hope. Out of that urge, hope, future, I create an ideal, a principle, a goal, and all the rest of it.

SP: And the question has to be asked: what is living without a sense of the future?

K: You are going to find out, don't ask me. So could we discuss this? Really, if you come to think of it, why do we have a future? I hope to be rich one day; I am a poor man, I work, I do all kinds of things to get rich. I hope to speak French, so I study, learn, all the rest of it. I hope to be a good carpenter. I can understand that—the hope that says speak French or English properly or whatever it is; there I have to study, spend months, and learn the language. I need time to be a good carpenter; I can't suddenly become the most extraordinary cabinet-maker. I need a lot of knowledge to enter into astrophysics and so on. Now I am asking, why do we have any other kind of hope?

EWA: Isn't it because you have already had a taste, however illusory it may be, of that which you are going to get?

K: Yes. Which means what? Reward and punishment.

EWA: Yes.

K: Is that a religious mind? They have experimented with reward and punishment on rats, which behave in one way if they are rewarded and in another way if they are punished. So is a religious mind dependent on reward and punishment? You don't question all this.

Q2: In hope, there is a desire for the more.

K: Of course, of course. More, better. A movement from the present to the future in different ways is hope.

Q2: We also have a desire for continuity.

K: Yes, the same thing. So what do you say? The majority of the people in the world have tremendous hope, not in the physical world but psychologically, a feeling that they will achieve something tomorrow or in ten years' time. I say to myself, 'Is that what makes a religious mind?' I will one day reach *nirvana*, heaven, God, or whatever it is, if I live strictly, have no sex, be unworldly, all the rest of it, in order to get that—is that a religious mind? I sacrifice, I give up the world in order to achieve heaven—is that a religious mind? I give up my property and become a monk in order to be saved by Jesus or by Rama, Sita, whatever you choose—is that a religious mind?

PNS: When you have hope, you have postponed.

K: Don't condemn it yet, just look at it all. Don't come to a conclusion, old boy; then you end all investigation. You are doing that.

PNS: When you have a hope that you will reach *nirvana* some day, you are postponing.

K: Postponing what?

PNS: Postponing your ideal that you will some day reach what you think is perfect.

K: You are not postponing.

PNS: I mean you want to continue what you are doing, and you want to go on casually.

K: Yes, that is about right. So is that a religious mind?

RD: It is easy to discard the kinds of examples which you are taking.

K: You can take any example.

RD: When you have discarded all those things...

K: Have you discarded?

RD: Yes, all those things which we've discussed.

K: No, no. Do you, in discussion, in investigation, as you begin to investigate, discard?

RD: Yes, I do.

K: Wait, sir. Not you discard; the very investigation is clearing the field.

RD: Yes.

K: Ah, no. Don't accept it so quickly, go into it.

RD: A point comes in the process of investigation when a lot of things get discarded.

K: Are you sure they do?

RD: But the essence of it is not discarded.

K: No, sir, don't play around. A religious mind, we just now said, has no feeling of reward and punishment. So we are asking, does a religious mind depend on reward and punishment? You shake your head; do you depend on reward and punishment?

SP: I was going to say that the nature of the mind is to seek reward and punishment, but the beginning of the religious mind starts with being aware of this process. I will say the beginning of a religious mind is with this.

K: Wait, wait. The moment the idea of beginning...

RD: Sir, there is a beginning in this.

K: All right, have your way.

SP: Let's listen to him. He is saying that by the very word *beginning* which we use, we are limiting it or creating a movement.

K: No. When you say, 'I am going to begin learning carpentry', the beginning is a movement to achieve something.

SP: I understood, I saw that immediately.

K: Ah, no. Not you saw or I saw.

SP: But here the beginning is not as a movement. Awareness has to start at some point, hasn't it? Where is the difficulty, sir?

K: Has a religious mind a beginning and an end?

SP: Let's start with the earlier question. You asked, 'Is it a religious mind which functions in terms of reward and punishment?'

K: Yes, that's all I'm asking.

SP: I said no. But the beginning of the religious quality comes into the mind when the mind is aware of this process.

K: No.

SP: No?

K: No.

SP: What place has awareness in all this? I think it is impossible to discuss if you say that in this process I am involving time. I am asking, where do you begin? Is there no beginning without an end?

K: I am going to answer you. Sir, what do you think?

RD: I see what you're saying. There is time when we talk of a process and a beginning.

SP: Don't abstract it. Actually what do you do?

K: Go on, what do you say?

RT: When there is a beginning, it implies time.

K: But she says, 'No, it doesn't imply time.' She says you must start somewhere.

RT: That's a reality for most of us.

K: Is that what you are trying to say?

SP: I want them all to say it.

RT: Yes, for most of us it is a reality: there is a beginning, there is a point at which awareness takes place.

K: Yes. Which is, I have to cook the meal, I have to light the fire. There is a beginning: going into the kitchen and doing all that.

RT: But that's quite different from what we are talking about.

K: That's what I want to be quite clear about—that we are quite clear on that point. She says—I am not criticizing her—there must be a beginning.

SP: The mind which starts questioning is the beginning; the mind which starts questioning the nature of the mind itself is a beginning. You may object to the word *beginning*.

K: No. You stick to the word, stick to the word. I understand what you are saying. That means I *begin* to understand. The understanding didn't exist before, but I am beginning to understand. That's what you are saying, aren't you? Go on, go into it.

KPK: That means we are taking time to understand something.

K: She doesn't mean that. She says, 'I am beginning to be aware that reward and punishment is not a religious mind. I am beginning to be aware of it.'

SP: I will make an amendment.

K: Make an amendment. [*Laughter*] I submit.

SP: I feel that reward and punishment is not a religious mind; I see that very clearly.

K: Stop there. Did you hear what she said?—'I see that when reward and punishment exist in one's consciousness, such a mind is not a religious mind.' Right?

SP: Yes.

K: When I *begin* to see...

SP: No. The perception has taken place. When such a seeing has taken place, that is the beginning of a religious mind. I feel the religious mind has great depths. I may be wrong, I have a concept.

K: Stop, stop, don't enlarge.

SP: Why do I use the word *beginning*? I seem to feel that there is something much greater than all this to a religious mind, but this is the beginning of a religious mind.

RD: If someone says that...

K: *You* say.

RD: Yes, I say. Someone says, let me say someone says...

K: Put the blame on others. [*Laughter*]

RD: ...that reward and punishment is not a religious mind. The question naturally arises: from what depth are you saying this?

K: Look, my boy, you make it all so complex. Why don't you be simple about it?

RD: Sir, you and I both see this fact.

K: No.

RD: You see it from a depth which...

K: No, I don't.

RD: I want to clear this, if you don't mind.

K: You see, you don't see all this. Go on.

RD: Sir, you made a statement that reward and punishment does not...

K: ...exist...

RD: ...in a religious mind.

K: Does not exist.

RD: You have moved.

K: No, no. Careful. I said that.

RD: You are going into a different dimension.

K: I said a religious mind has no reward and punishment, doesn't move in that direction at all.

RD: Now I listen to this statement and feel that there is a ring of truth in it.

K: You take too long about it, old boy.

RD: Yes, but we do.

K: Don't. Be simple. My shoe hurts, I take it off. [*Laughs*] I don't elaborate on who made the shoe, why did he... You are doing that all the time. Take it simply.

Begin—not begin—just take it simply. What do you say? I am going to come back presently.

PNS: Suppose I say I *begin* to understand reward and punishment: then if I see it completely, I don't begin. I either see it completely or...

SP: No, I'll explain what I said. When the mind moves in the direction of reward and punishment, it is not a religious mind. It is very clear, I don't take time to see it. Then I made a statement to Krishnaji that that is the beginning of a religious mind. Now I see that by introducing the word *beginning*, I have brought in measurement to this quality of a religious mind. So I take back that word *beginning*. The moment I use the word *beginning*...

K: Ah, use the word.

SP: If I use that word, I am bringing in measurement. I see that.

K: Therefore remove the word.

SP: But even then there is something like moving. What do you do from there? One has seen the truth that reward and punishment is not a religious mind. Then from there what?

K: Is that an idea? One makes a statement: a religious mind has no reward and punishment in its consciousness, in its mind. A religious human being—put it differently—has no reward and punishment; he doesn't look in that direction at all. I am still saying the same thing, and you are saying, 'When I see that, I am already moving towards...' I think you have been constantly repeating that in different words.

SP: I am listening. I want to know where we are going.

K: I don't know where I am going, but this is how it sounds. When I see something to be true, there is no beginning. I see it.

SP: All right.

K: Ah no, not all right. Have you reward and punishment in your mind? Do you feel that you must have this?

SP: Not really reward and punishment. It is a sort of desire, a wanting.

K: I am just an ordinary human being. You tell me reward and punishment has no place in a religious mind. I don't make of it an idea, a principle, something outside of my skin. I see immediately the truth of such a statement. And I wait there; I don't say, 'I must begin, I must perceive, who is the perceiver?' I see that

the statement is an extraordinary one. And I have lived all my life with reward and punishment. It has been my sustenance, and you come along and say to me that a religious mind has not this quality. I immediately capture it. There is no *beginning* to it; it's so.

SP: With that perception, will you say that's a religious mind?

K: That's only a very small part of it.

SP: That's what I am saying.

K: Ah no, no.

PNS: Why do you say it is a small part of it?

K: You want to pin me down. I refuse.

PNS: Why do you say it is a small part of it? Then you are no different from me.

K: I want to throw out everything. By God! [*Laughter*]

PNS: If you say it is a small part of it...

K: Ah no, I withdraw it. Don't beat the dead dog.

RD: You asked a question: is that an idea? I think we've to go into it.

K: That's the real question.

RD: That's the real thing. Now, what do you mean when you ask, 'Is it an idea?'?

K: I'll tell you. You tell me a mind that has reward and punishment is not a religious mind. Or you tell me that reward and punishment has no place in a religious mind. Now I hear that, I make an abstraction of the fact into an idea, a conclusion, and then say, 'How am I to carry out that idea? I must begin somewhere.' So the abstraction of a fact is an idea.

KJ: When a fact is converted into an idea, then the mind starts trying to know the ways in which it is moving in the direction of reward and punishment.

K: Yes.

KJ: It tries to stop the grosser ones and sees that the subtler ones have come upon them slowly.

K: Yes, sir. I am asking, why move away from the fact? When you move away from the fact, then it becomes an abstraction, an idea, a belief, all the rest of it. Don't accept what I am saying; let's look, examine it. Has reward and punishment a place in my mind? This is not just an easy question to answer; it has such hidden possibilities. One can deceive oneself terribly, so one has to never come to a conclusion: 'Yes, I have got it.' So let's move.

RD: And if the mind has within it reward and punishment, what is its relationship to such a question?

K: None. Or you will say 'nonsense'.

RD: No, I am not saying 'nonsense'.

K: If my mind is stuck on reward and punishment and you come along and say something different, either I reject you altogether, or I begin to understand that reward and punishment has really no value. I begin to question, I begin to ask; that's all I am doing. I don't say I reject what you say. I ask, is there any truth in it? And I examine how the dogs behave, how the pigeons behave, how human beings behave when there is reward or when there is punishment—fear and all the rest of it. So I see this whole phenomenon operating right through. From the smallest insect to the highest scientist, it is the same phenomenon. I may be a great scientist, but I want the Nobel Prize. Sir, you are not facing the thing—all religions are based on this.

RD: You see the mind...

K: You don't take the whole thing in. Don't bring in the mind, just look at the whole phenomenon first.

KJ: Suppose someone says to me that reward and punishment has no role in the religious mind, I do not reject that statement; I begin to examine it. Examination takes time.

K: No examining. Either you see the truth *instantly* and therefore it is finished, or you say, 'By Jove, I must examine this, take time', which means you will never come to it.

Q2: One of the reasons why we are glossing over this fact is that we seem to be in a hurry to find out what else there is to a religious mind.

K: I am doing it, slowly, step by step. I don't know what a religious mind is, but I do know, I see the fact that reward and punishment has no role in a religious mind. That, to me, is an *absolute* fact. To me. So I ask, 'What is a religious mind?' Has it a belief, has it a principle, a goal, an ideal, a perfect heaven? Has

belief a place in the religious mind, or a principle, a conclusion, a perfect human being, a perfect heaven, etc.?

PNS: No.

K: Do you have a belief, do you have a principle? Don't say no right away.

PNS: I mean a mind that has belief is not a religious mind.

K: Have you a belief?

PNS: I don't know.

K: Therefore hesitate. Have you a belief? Belief in the sense 'I believe in God, I believe there is heaven, I believe I'll be saved, I believe an outside agency is going to help me'; 'I believe in the psychiatrist'; 'I believe in my wife.' When you say, 'I believe in my wife', you've already the idea of loyalty. When I say, 'I believe in my wife', I have already said, 'I don't believe you.'

SP: No one says, 'I've belief in my wife.' [*Laughter*]

K: So have I a belief, an ideal? Go on, sirs, have you?

SP: An idea of what? Any belief? Or belief with reference to a religious mind?

K: Belief. I believe the dynamo works.

SP: Either the dynamo works or it doesn't.

K: Ah, no. Don't enlarge it, let me enlarge it. [*Laughs*] I believe the dynamo works, I believe the car will run. I believe the sun will rise—I never *believe* the sun will rise. I believe there is God. I believe there's an outside agency. I believe there is somebody helping me inwardly, some spirit is guiding me. I believe I have achieved some high experience, I believe I have got truth by its tail. There are so many beliefs, right? Have you? You don't believe New York exists: New York is there. Moscow—you don't believe in it. So what place has belief? Why do you have a belief at all? Do you have a belief?

RD: I can't answer that.

K: You are so frightened. Do you believe?

RD: I have to find out why there has been belief.

K: I have been asking for the last hour. What do you mean you'll find out?

RD: I watch. As I move out of this hall, I'm going to watch.

K: But now?

RD: How can I answer? Is it possible to answer now?

K: Yes, of course.

RD: I really don't see how one can answer now.

K: Wait a minute. Have you been angry?

RD: Have I been angry? In the past?

K: Why do you say 'past'? Have you been angry?

RD: Yes, I have been angry.

K: Right? Now, do you believe? Don't say, 'I must think over it, I must ponder and find out.' It is all obvious. As you say, you have been angry.

RD: I have believed.

K: Do you believe now? God's sake! [*Laughs*] I am not bullying you.

RD: I really don't know how to answer this question.

PNS: Does it look so simple for you to sit here and say 'I don't believe'?

K: Yes, sir. You are all so complicated about it. All right. So what next? No reward and punishment, no belief as ideals, principles, conclusions, an outside agency, a spirit guiding me: 'I believe in the Masters, I believe in something else.' Such a belief has no place in a religious mind. I am saying this for myself; don't accept it, be sceptical. For myself it is a fact. Then, has a religious mind a future?

RT: Future would imply a reward.

K: Yes. Go on, examine it. A future: 'I will be good.'

RT: Hoping for a reward.

K: Of course. I'll be good; I'm not, but I'll be—that's a future. So I'm asking, has a religious mind a future? By God, this stumps you.

SP: It is obvious that as long as the whole process of becoming exists, it is not a religious mind.

K: Have you?

SP: It's there.

K: Or you stop it.

SP: I can watch the process of becoming; I can't say I have stopped it.

K: Not you stop it.

SP: You asked, have you stopped it?

K: No, I didn't. When you make a statement of that kind, is it a supposition, a verbal statement? Or do you say, 'I don't quite fully understand the depth of becoming, the fullness of it, the immensity that the world has given to that word'? Everybody is becoming something.

SP: Living itself is becoming.

K: Please don't complicate it, keep it simple. Do I really understand the full significance of becoming, which is the future?—'I am becoming more intelligent', 'I am becoming more good at tennis', 'I am beginning to understand the nature of physics', 'I see I am slowly becoming a better carpenter.' And also in the religious world there is the whole hierarchical principle of becoming. So I can't say, 'Yes, I have no beginning or end.' So I have to look at this whole complexity of human endeavour to be, or to become, something.

RD: That is precisely the reason why we can't answer a question like yours.

K: I can.

RD: You can, I can't.

K: Why not?

RD: I am looking at the full implications of becoming, I am watching it.

K: You see, you are not quick enough.

RD: I am not.

K: Don't keep on repeating it. You don't capture it quickly.

RD: So what can I do to capture it quickly? Not do in the sense of becoming.

K: You understand becoming? Where there is a beginning and an end, it is a process of becoming, right?

RD: That's clear.

K: I have the beginning of a toothache. So becoming has a cause and an end. Don't agree to all this, go into it very carefully. What is becoming? Who is becoming? Is thought becoming?—better thought, nobler thought, wider, expansive, profound.

RH: The image I have of myself.

K: So what is all this becoming?

SP: The image correcting itself, improving itself.

K: When you say, 'I am becoming', hold it for a minute, look at it, feel it, go into it, let it move. So I question whether there is a becoming at all. 'I am angry, I'll be without anger'—future. Is there a future to anger?

SP: I feel I am angry, I am less angry and less angry; therefore there is the illusion of becoming and reaching a point where I'll never be angry. Because there is the 'less and less and less', there is this whole process.

K: So it is the same thing: that is, less and less.

SP: Are you saying 'the less' is an illusion?

K: 'I am becoming less and less and less violent'—what a statement to make! [*Laughter*] The man who is becoming less and less violent is still violent. No?

SP: That is so, but I am saying the becoming continues because of this evolutionary reality, which is the illusion.

K: Ah, wait a minute. I question evolution.

SP: Do you mean to say there is no 'less and less'.

K: No.

SP: 'More and more'?

K: No. What is it you are asking?

RH: Becoming less and less violent may be just a result of getting older.

K: I am getting older. [*Laughter*]

SP: No. Even at a young age you can become less angry. Isn't that the whole process of becoming? We are discussing becoming. He asks, is there a becoming at all? Let me trace back the question. I say there is becoming because there is this illusion of less and less, therefore there is the movement towards becoming.

KPK: But if I totally remain with the fact that I am violent, there is no question of becoming.

SP: 'If I remain' is a supposition.

PNS: Becoming is an illusion.

K: Don't say things you don't mean, unless you do it yourself.

RD: What do you do? What do you actually do? Isn't there a becoming?

KPK: I remain with the fact that I am violent, and I am not interested in whether there is non-violence or anything like that. I don't project anything.

RD: What do you mean by 'remain with violence'?

KPK: I see that I am violent, that's all. I don't go away from it, saying that I want to get rid of it or that it is bad or good.

RD: What does your seeing that you are violent do? What is the nature of that seeing? Is it just a recognition that you are violent, and you don't do anything?

KPK: No. It is not just a recognition because recognition again means comparison with my past experiences.

K: Sir, did you hear what I said? Not that you should hear it. If I can put my oar into this: I said there is no evolution.

SP: That's what I asked you—whether the whole process is an illusion, evolution is an illusion.

K: There is the evolution of an acorn becoming an oak, an acorn moving towards its fulfilment, a small child becoming an old man, evolving, moving to an end. So which becoming are we talking about?

HP: Is not biological evolution a fact?

K: I said so, I said so; that's a fact. I'd be silly to deny that.

HP: But along with biological evolution, there are also changes occurring in the quality of perception.

K: Look, sir, I am not talking of perception. There is evolution, physical evolution. A seed becoming a bush, another seed becoming a great big tree—there is evolution there. The baby growing into a man, becoming, knowledge—in all that there is evolution. Do you agree to that? Of course there is no denying it. Ten years ago there was no computer, but by all the process of science and so on there is a personal computer now in practically every home in America. There has been evolution from Ford T-model to Mercedes. So there is evolution there, and he is saying there is no other evolution.

HP: How can you make this definite statement that there is no evolution?

K: I am making it.

HP: What is your reason behind it?

K: I'll tell you, if you are interested. What do you think of such a statement? Nonsense? A little bit touched in the head? Go on, I am not being angry, I am just asking. How do you respond when a man, fairly serious, says there is no such thing as evolution apart from the biological?

KPK: If I accept that there is evolution in the psychological field also, that means I can change a bad thought into a good thought.

K: No, sir, not change. First listen to a statement like that. It may be nonsense. I consider X to be serious, and he has shown on different occasions that he is a serious man. Whenever I meet him, I take it for granted that he is serious, that he is a man to be considered, that he has substance—not in wealth—that he is a man of substance. And he makes a statement that there is no evolution at all except in the other field. Do I reject him? Do I say, 'Is something wrong with him to make such a statement?'? And the most highly enlightened people have said, 'Become, practise, do this, this, this.'

PNS: Why do you call them 'highly enlightened' when they say this?

K: I'll give you an example. The Buddha is supposed to have reached enlightenment *after* fasting, renouncing. Correct me, the Buddhists here, correct me please. He fasted, he gave up his home—it was a gradual process till he ultimately reached enlightenment; that means he evolved to that. I question it. I doubt it. I deny it.

PNS: But if I may point out...

K: First listen to it. Don’t answer, just listen to it first, capture all this.

PNS: But I want to ask a personal question about you.

K: Ah no, no, no. Hands off, hands off! I know what you are going to ask me.

PNS: Why not, sir? Why should I not ask?

K: Listen to it, sir, first listen. All your literature, sacred books, is becoming—which is evolution. And he comes along and says to me, ‘That’s sheer nonsense, it doesn’t exist.’ And he is a serious man; I’ve watched him, I’ve talked to him, I’ve listened to him, and I find him quite serious. So do I reject that statement? Do I say, ‘What’s wrong with his head? He has a hole in his head’? Just listen to it: the whole movement of religious, psychological, psychiatric therapy, everything is there. How do you react to the statement that there is no psychological evolution? How do you react to it?

HP: Would you deny that you went through suffering...?

K: Just a minute, sir. If you want to go through the person [K] then we have to go into it quite differently. I’m not sure that this is the right occasion for this. I’m looking at it as a world phenomenon, not me going through that or you going through that. If you want to ask me from the book somebody wrote, ‘Why all this?’ I’ll tell you. But I am treating it as a world phenomenon, not as an individual phenomenon, as a single-person phenomenon. This phenomenon is asserted by all religious people, right?

AP: May I ask you for a little clarification? We are discussing the religious mind, and in that context you said...

K: ...the religious mind has no evolution.

AP: That’s it. A person comes upon the religious mind, not through a gradual process, but he either has it or doesn’t have it.

K: No, no. You see, that’s a wrong statement. I am asking, do you see the truth that psychological evolution is an illusion? Is this a bombshell?

PNS: It is.

K: Is it a bombshell?

PNS: It is a bombshell.

K: All right. Why have all these people said there is psychological becoming, which is psychological evolution? Practically everybody has said this.

Q2: This is just an extension from the other field.

K: Of course, of course. But I won't go into this. It is an extension of the other, but I am just asking, why have they said it?

HP: Because psychological function is very much dependent on biological function. So if there is evolution in the biological sense...

K: There *is*, I said.

HP: There is.

K: Of course.

HP: It is very closely related.

K: Therefore I am questioning that. I may be wrong and they may be right. I say, 'Let's look at it; why accept anybody, including the Shankaras, including all the literature?' Why accept them?

SP: If evolution is in relation to a religious mind, there is no evolution. But will you deny betterment at all as a ground?

K: *Absolutely*. It is like self-improvement.

SP: Without the self. [*Laughter*] The negation of the self as the field of improvement.

K: Sir, Nagarjuna is supposed to be an expert in denial.

AP: Yes.

K: Was that a process?

AP: No, he also says what you are saying.

K: Too bad. [*Laughter*]

AP: There is a particular verse of his which I don't remember.

K: Doesn't matter.

SP: Krishnaji said this very clearly the other day: perception, negation, is still a process; the whole thing is still a process in time.

K: Who said it?

SP: You said it.

K: What?

SP: You asked, ‘What will you teach?’ And I replied that I know what perception is, what negation is. He said, ‘All these twenty, thirty years it has still been a process.’

K: Of course. I am saying there is no such thing as becoming better, worse. If you accept that word *evolution*, that word contains all that—backwards, forwards, sideways, all the rest of it.

SP: Is there then no difference between good and bad in this field of the known?

K: The good has no relationship with the evil. If the good has a relationship with the evil, then it is not good. If love has a relationship to hate—it’s so obvious.

Q2: Is it because all this has a single root that you are saying...

K: Yes, sir.

Q2: ...that there can’t be a relationship?

K: That’s right. I wish you would discuss this.

PNS: You said ‘single root’. What is it?

K: You admit, don’t you, that there’s biological evolution. Closely related is the extension of the biological into the psychological world. In the psychological world, man has built a tremendous structure of hierarchy—the bad becoming the good, the ignorant becoming full of knowledge, the violent becoming non-violent, and so on. And this has been our conditioning. If you don’t like to use that word because you see that limits it—this has been the movement of man. There are several caves in the south of France where there are three-to-five-thousand-year-old pictures of battles between the good and the bad. There can be a battle only if they are related. If they are not related, there is no battle. Careful, sir, don’t agree to this. I am related to you as my brother. Because we are related, we begin to quarrel. You don’t quarrel with a stranger, right? So we are saying that there is no psychological evolution *at all at any time*. If you want it, I’ll go into it with reason, sanity, step by step.

RS: Krishnaji, can I ask: if you deny psychological evolution, is there something else in its place?

K: I don’t deny it. It is a wrong question. That’s reward and punishment.

RS: No. Factually, if you deny psychological evolution...

K: I don’t deny it: it doesn’t exist.

RS: But there must be something else in its place.

K: Why should there be? The moment you say there must be something else in its place, what does that imply?

RS: Its counterpart. We say that in the biological plane evolution has produced certain things; some transformations have taken place through biological evolution.

K: Of course. I know.

RS: Similarly we can ask, what is the counterpart of this in the psychological plane?

K: What do you mean ‘counterpart’?

RS: Transformation.

K: He explained it, sir. The biological fact of growth, evolution, is extended into the other, into the psychological world, and that may be a false thing. We have extended it because we see everything becoming, growing, expanding, multiplying biologically, and we have that same mentality here: we extend that fact into the psychological world. And I am saying that that doesn’t exist. But you ask, when that ceases what is next? Find out why you asked the question.

RS: And the other question is...

K: First begin with that. Why do you say, ‘There is something, there must be, or is there’? Isn’t that part of your—forgive me for saying it—part of your reward and punishment? If there is no evolution psychologically, what have I left, what is there?

RS: I feel that there has to be something.

K: Ah, the same thing.

Q1: Then what’s the action?

K: There is only one action.

EWA: In psychological evolution, isn’t it the idea of the ‘me’ that is supposed to...?

K: I don’t want to enter into the ‘me’ becoming, into the ‘me’ getting better, into self-improvement. All that, I say, is illusion.

EWA: So it can’t evolve.

K: There is no evolution. But he wants to know what is there in its place. There is *nothing*. Nothing! You know what the word means?—‘not a thing’. Also, it means there is nothing that thought has put there. Right? What do you do with that statement? Come on, sir, what do you do with that statement? What is your reaction? Don’t you burn with it and say, ‘What nonsense are you talking about’? Don’t you throw a brick at me? Or you are going to sit there and do nothing?

RS: Krishnaji, if we can go into why psychological evolution does not exist, then we may understand this better.

K: Now, do you want an explanation? That’s what you are asking. I will explain, I said. But do you want an explanation? Will explanation, description, analysis make it clear to you? Or you see it instantly, capture it? Will an explanation, a verbal analysis, a verbal clarification, help you? Which is intellect meeting intellect, right? The function of the intellect is to discern, to weigh, to question, to reason, to be logical, to analyse, all that. Is that what you want? I will do it, but still at the end of it, will words clarify? It will clarify to a certain extent, but will that clarification of words and the meaning of words help you to understand or see the truth of that? Is intelligence a matter of words? Is intelligence a matter of thought? Is intelligence a matter of conclusion? Does intelligence contain any explanation, description, analysis? Or is intelligence something beyond all this, totally unrelated to thought? As you are all teachers, how will you convey this to the students from the age of six? How old are they when they come?

PNS: Eight.

K: From the age of seven, eight, how do you convey to them that the good has no relationship with the bad? They all want to be good, children do. Don’t you know? Of course. But how do you help them not to associate the good with the bad? If you admit that the good is related to evil, that hate is part of love—which sounds so appalling—how do you convey all this to those chaps? Go on, sir, you are the teachers. Suppose you are my students, young, eight years old—I wish you were all eight—I want to convey to you that good is totally unrelated to evil, they have no connection with each other. I want to tell you this. So how do I begin to tell you this? Shall I tell you what I’ll do? I want them to listen to me. I don’t want them to understand that good is not related to evil. I want them to listen to me, that’s all I’m concerned with. How shall I help them to listen? If they listen to me, it is over. Tell me.

PNS: I listen to you.

K: You see, you are always playing the double game. I ask, how can I help them to listen to me? They are jabbering like monkeys, so how shall I help them to listen to me? If I can help them to listen to me, then communication is very simple. They are not complicated like you gentlemen; they are very simple. They may be mischievous, but the mind hasn't been cluttered by education, by cleverness, all the rest of it. So I want to help them listen to me; what shall I do? They listen to a story, an exciting story. I don't have to ask them to listen to me: they are all there. Now, I want them to listen to me in the same way. What shall I do?

KPK: They will listen to me only if they have some kind of trust or confidence in me.

K: Oh, no. They have no confidence in you when you tell them a jolly good exciting story; they are all ears. Do you realize something? You don't listen to me. Not that you should. I am not being disrespectful.

PNS: You are not able to make us listen to you.

K: Find out why you don't listen. Why don't those children listen to you? The other day I was walking on the beach with a little boy of ten. We were walking together holding hands, and whatever I said he was swallowing it hook, line, and sinker. You people don't even know all this. What's the matter with all of you? You are all teachers. What is it that makes a little boy listen to an exciting story so that he never looks out of the window, never flutters? He is absolutely still because the story itself is so exciting; he is in it. What will help him to listen to you? Not reward and punishment; then it becomes something ugly. What will you do?

RD: In the case of the story the boy is absorbed. Now, if he meets a teacher or a mind that is profound, he will listen.

K: The story is exciting; there is nothing deep, nothing profound. Have you read *Treasure Island*?

RD: Yes.

K: Long John Silver. You tell him that story; he is motionless, listening to you. Why?

RD: It is not only the story, but the way in which it is told, the passion with which it is told.

K: Don't elaborate on the damn thing.

RD: He is absorbed in the story.

K: Yes, why?

RD: He finds that when he is absorbed he is quiet, he is not naughty, he is happy.

K: He doesn't go through all the stuff you are going through.

RD: No, he doesn't say all this.

K: He is excited by the story, about how Long John Silver is going to kill somebody; he is thrilled by it. You are implying all this kind of profound stuff.

RD: But it is going on, and he may not be aware of it.

K: Oh, for God's sake!

RD: Krishnaji, what are you saying?

K: Keep it simple, old boy. I want him to listen to me. I want him to listen to me when I talk about mathematics, when I talk about the birds, when I talk about the rock on the hill, the shape of it. And I want him also to listen to *Treasure Island*. Listening is the same factor right through whether I am talking about mathematics or the rocks, the beasts of the field being in league with the stones. Oh, you don't know anything about it. I want him to listen to all that. Now, he will listen only to an exciting story.

RD: No, he will listen to many things. He will listen when you talk to him about being polite, nice. He'll listen to you.

K: Now, will he listen to you when you talk about mathematics?

RD: Sometimes he may not.

K: I know. Please look at the whole thing. He listens to an exciting story with total attention, and he doesn't pay the same attention in other fields. These are facts. Now, how can you help that boy or girl to pay attention? Tell me how. When he listens to a story, his attention is not forced.

RD: It is not forced.

K: He is not compelled. He is ahead of the story. And attention apparently has become a thing which is forced, right? How will you help him to pay attention without force? That's the point. How will you help him? Come on, move.

RD: When a student is fond of the teacher, it is very easy to make him attend to the many things he says.

K: No, no. Look, I am the boy. You tell me the story and I am all with you. And then when you talk about mathematics, I am looking out of the window, I am looking at the tree, at the birds or at an ant going across the floor or a beetle, and I want to go with it, catch it, look at it. Now, how will you help me to pay attention to you when you talk about mathematics?

RD: If he is fond of...

K: No. I want him to listen, to help him to listen whether he is a friend, enemy, nobody. I want him to learn the art of listening, not to a friend only.

RD: Yes, but first you begin with listening to mathematics.

K: No.

RD: Sir, if you jump into this, from the art of your wanting to listen to the art of listening itself...

K: No. You are imputing a lot of things. I am saying I want him to listen, whether he listens to a friend, to a teacher who has great affection for him, or to his father who beats him up, or to his mother who cuddles him, or to a stranger. I want him to listen, which is to pay attention. Right?

RD: Without reward and punishment?

K: No. For God's sake, just listen; you are not listening to me. You are bringing in reward and punishment.

RD: Krishnaji, at one point you talk of listening to a story, and then you talk of listening without reward and punishment.

K: I did not. You talked about it.

RD: I did, I am sorry.

K: So you have not listened to what I am saying. I want him to pay attention. Not want, you understand? I want to help him to pay attention. How shall I do it?

PNS: I don't know.

K: You find out. I am the boy. I am looking out of the window, and you are talking about mathematics. I don't look out of the window when you tell me a story, but when you are talking about biology or mathematics or whatever it is, I am very carefully watching whether you are looking in my direction. If you are not looking in my direction, I look out. Now, how will you help me to pay attention? Not to you—to pay attention. How? Don't complicate it. If I am the

teacher, I will encourage him to look. I'll help the boy or the girl to look out of the window and never say, 'Pay attention to what I am saying.' I will help him to look at the ant closely, at the beetle crossing the floor, at the leaf. I will tell him: 'Look, forget the class, let's look at it much more intensely.' You have got it there, right? What do you say to that? You see, sir, I have never paid attention, I never forced it: 'I must attend, I must listen, I must do this.' What is important in attention?

PNS: Accurate listening.

K: No. Find out, sir. What is important in attention? I think I'll leave you with that question till tomorrow, may I? Would you say that in attention watching is most important? Watching how you sit, what kind of shirt you have, the trousers, whether they are properly creased, whether you're spoiling the crease sitting that way. I am paying attention, and I am watching closely the pencil in your pocket and the sag in the pocket when you have heavy things. You understand? So I am watching, and the watching creates an extraordinary sensitivity. Come on, sir, I don't have to tell you.

Madras, 9 January 1983

8

On Being a Guest of the World

The creative movement—The religious mind is the most creative mind—A mind that has never been hurt and has the quality of pristine originality—Helping to free the students and teachers from hurt—On examinations and fear—In a place where there is no fear, what happens to the student?—The feeling of being at home—The difference between being a guest and being at home—The true meaning of Vedanta as the end of knowledge—On there being no duality and no evolution.

Krishnamurti (K): Shall we go on with what we were talking about yesterday? Can we make these schools something really extraordinary, some of the best schools in the world? Don't look so depressed. [*Laughter*] Can we? Not only academically—that is a secondary issue—but as a place where there are really people who are tremendously active inwardly, not just academically turning out, day after day, the same old stuff. Because from what one sees in this country, things are going rather bad, breaking up—the south against the north and so on. And it seems rather so futile to turn out B.A.s and M.A.s to get jobs in America, in Harvard; it seems such a waste of our energy. Not that they shouldn't go to Harvard or Cambridge or Oxford, but can't we do something more, vital, create a really excellent human being? Can we?

Can we discuss what is the creative movement? Not the inventive movement, which is technology and all the rest of it, but a creative flow, a creative river. What does one mean by *creative*? You paint a good picture, or write a marvellous poem or a very deep essay on horses or on Vedanta—is there anybody like that? I am sorry, I am not comparing horses to Vedanta; perhaps they are related. [*Laughter*] I wouldn't call all that creativeness.

Can one say one's days must be swifter than a weaver's shuttle? (This is said in the Bible, in the Old Testament, not in the New Testament. I was reading it the other day.) So that we are alive. Can we do it? Can we, in Rishi Valley, Bangalore, Madras, Rajghat? In these places can we, in our relationship, in our work, in our way of life, create something really profound and deep and abiding, strong, not fluctuating? Can we do that so that we are not mere intellectuals but human beings? Can we? We will come back to it a little later.

To go on with what we were talking about yesterday: I think a religious mind is the most creative mind in the world. It is essentially a free mind, an unconditioned mind. Can we go into that—a mind that, first of all, can never be hurt? You know the word *innocence*: the root meaning of it is *nocere*; it comes from Latin and Italian and means 'not capable of being hurt, wounded, scarred'. Not scarred by knowledge too, scarred by the various incidents of one's life, but to have a mind that has never been wounded, hurt, scratched, so that it has the quality of real freedom and pristine originality. Am I saying all things right?

SP: It is too perfect for all of us.

K: No, not perfect.

RB: If you say it is a mind which doesn't get hurt, it is one thing, but if you say it has never been hurt, then there is no hope for anybody.

K: Ah no, no. [*Laughter*] A mind that has been hurt is like a relationship: I have divorced my wife, and then a few years later I say, 'I'm awfully sorry, let's get married again.' That joining together again is never the same as the first. In the same way, is it possible not to be hurt first of all and to inquire if there is a mind that has never been touched by hurt? Suppose my mind is hurt by all the incidents, by all the accidents of life, can I be free of it? There must be a mind which is totally untouched. And can this mind, which has been scratched, wounded and hurt and spoilt, be free and touch that? Not touch it, but be with it, be of it, be in it. I think it is possible. I wonder if I am making anything clear? Am I? Or am I talking some romantic stuff?

Sir, let's take all those students: they come to you frightened, nervous, anxious about examinations, marks, degrees—the whole pressure of education. Normal education is something terrible, right? And it hurts their brains, it distorts, colours their brain. Is it possible to educate them without all that? What do you say? You are the experts. I send my son or my daughter to your school. I know they have been hurt: I have scolded them, I have been irritated with them. Perhaps out of this irritation I might have slapped them and apologized afterwards, but the apology afterwards is never the same. It can never mend the broken bridge; you can remake that bridge, but it is never the same.

So I send my son to you, and he comes to you with that burden, with that conditioning, with that fear, with that sense of being scolded all the time: 'Do this, don't do that.' And you, who are also hurt, wounded, scratched, spoilt, how will you deal with this? I am scratched and wounded and so is my student. What is my action? Come on, sirs.

RS: I think that in yesterday's discussion one thing was implicit. You asked, 'Can we inquire into a religious mind?' And that presupposes that even 'bundles'[1] can carry out this inquiry, does it not?

K: Yes, of course, of course. By 'bundle' I mean fragments.

RS: Yes. So one can inquire.

K: Of course, of course, and become aware one is fragmented. But I am asking a different question. It is important if you have to bring about a different human being, and the function of a school is that, if you admit that. You are hurt and I am hurt, and I am your student. And a human being who has been hurt is never

[1] As in the previous discussions, the word is used here to indicate the various psychological factors that human beings are made up of.

the same unless he is totally free from it. To have a mind that has understood that it has been hurt and totally wipes out the hurt so that it is a free mind—such a free mind can inquire into something much deeper. So it is important that you and I as educators in this kind of a school help to free the student and ourselves from hurt. Do you see the importance of not being hurt? Do you really see it, not just verbally, but deep down in your heart, in your guts, in your blood, see that a wounded human being, however healed, will never be the same? What is important is that he should be free of it completely. You really feel the urgency of it, the necessity of it, the damage it does. And you know we have been damaged—you the teacher and me the student. How will you help me to be free of this thing? I wonder if you realize that a human being who is not hurt is a totally different human being?

What will you do? Do you understand what it implies? No comparison, right? May I go into it? It is dangerous, but may I? It means no marks, no gradation, no examination, no classification. (He may take an examination at the end of two years.) I know that sounds impossible in a school where probably everybody—the parents, the whole system—needs this. Can we do this? Which means to have an autonomous school, our own school so that we can do what we want.

AP: Don't you think that what you are saying is too utopian?

K: Oh, no.

AP: A teacher working with a student has to understand to what degree what he is saying is received or not received. Whether a student has understood it or not is the teacher's responsibility.

K: I am saying it is the teacher's responsibility. I am the teacher, and there must be the realization that a wounded human being can never be a good human being. A human being who has been hurt, who has been mauled around, can never be a good human being.

AP: That's all right.

K: And our educational system is mauling them around like a tiger, tearing them up.

AP: I think it is an exaggeration.

K: Oh, no. You think this is an exaggeration?

PNS: No, sir, it is not an exaggeration. What you are saying is not an exaggeration at all.

K: Tell him that, argue with him.

Q1: What is the use of running these schools like any other school? There are many schools all over India; what is the use of running this school in the same manner, with examinations, fear, and so on? To continue the same thing?

AP: I am not saying 'the same thing'. I am saying that you may change the system, but the evaluation of a student, of how much he has understood, is absolutely the responsibility of the teacher.

Q1: Let the teacher know it, not the students. Don't tell the students what their grades or marks are.

K: Sir, wait. Probably, if we did this, no parents will send you their children.

AP: I am not bringing in the parent at all. It is the responsibility of the teacher...

K: I am saying the same thing.

AP: ...not to inflict an inferiority complex on the child. If the child gets out of that school with a feeling that he has been neglected, that he is not equal to the other students, he will go out into the world with a permanent feeling of inferiority. I have seen dozens of boys going out of Gandhian schools with a permanent sense of inferiority and all the complications of it. I say it is the responsibility of the teacher to see that there is proper evaluation. It should be rational, sensible; it should not allow examinations to dominate the process of learning. All that I agree to, but you can't throw the baby with the bathwater.

SF: If there could be examination without fear, that might be useful.

K: Yes, that's what I am saying.

SF: It might be useful because children cannot themselves determine when they understand a subject.

K: Yes, but don't let's battle over examinations or argue over examinations. Examinations will be necessary—examinations without fear, as he points out. What does that mean? As a teacher I see the importance of this. I really do, it's not just a verbal assertion. I feel it is very important that they should have no fear in our schools, absolutely no fear. Which doesn't mean that they become impudent, right? And examinations, whether it is in the First Form, Tenth Form or the ultimate Form, breed fear: students become nervous, anxious, and all the rest of it. Now, to carry that out, what is my responsibility? Let me talk this over a little bit, and then I want to discuss something quite different. May we? What is my responsibility? I don't want them to have fear, and I want them to pass examinations without any sense of being ill at ease. What shall I do? Isn't it my responsibility, as I talk, as I instruct? If I am the teacher and I see the importance of the student not having any fear, what shall I do? Ultimately he may have to

pass an exam, to show the government, to show the parents that he is ‘A’ level and ‘0’ level and all the rest of it. So what shall I do? How shall I from the very beginning see that he has no fear? Come on, sirs, you are the teachers.

HP: Children come into contact with so many teachers in our schools, and I find that most of the teachers themselves are afraid of losing their jobs.

K: That’s a different question, right? They are here, and you want them to stay on and teach, don’t you? Not only teach; in teaching the student you yourself want to flower and not just be a beastly little teacher. Sorry, I am using the word to mean ‘ordinary’. You don’t want to be just a schoolmaster; you want to become a total human being, a human being who has depth and width, delight, passion, beauty, goodness. And as a teacher, what shall I do to see that the boy has no fear?

RD: First, I must be very gentle with him.

K: No, no. You said ‘gentle’, what does that mean? Soft? Make him into a sissy? In a school if you are too gentle, too soft, and too soft-voiced...

RT: As it is, some of our children who leave the school find it very difficult to adjust when they go to other institutions.

K: So much the better. [*Laughter*]

RD: Often they don’t have the strength to meet that difficulty.

K: It is our job to create it. As a teacher I want to help him to have no fear; what shall I do? And at the end they may have to pass an exam. So what shall I do? Would you consider every day how the boy is studying, what he is, what he is not, so that you know what he is doing? You may make a secret report to each other, to the headmaster, or whoever it may be, saying the boy is poor in this, but never let him know. Would you agree to that? So you are watching him, and he knows you are watching him in a totally different spirit from watching him whether he passes examination or not. I don’t know if I making myself clear.

RH: Which means you have to watch everything, not just the academic side.

K: Yes, yes, I was coming to that. Not only in the class, but watch when he eats, how he eats, what he puts on. Can you do this?

PNS: We can do it.

K: So that you are in constant contact with him, and he knows that he is not going to be punished. So that it is not First Form, Second Form, Tenth Form: it is a movement. It is a movement of a growing mind which has not been hurt by

examinations, by words, by gestures. Parents have hurt him, and when he comes to the school, if you carry on the same thing, he says, ‘My God’ and gives up. But if there is this feeling that here there is no fear, what does that create in the boy? Come on, look at it. You are the teacher, you have come to Rishi Valley. He has been scared stiff, he has been beaten, frightened, all the rest of it. He comes to you and feels and knows that you are not going to punish him, you are not going to reward him, you are not going to beat him up, you are not going to say, ‘Do this and don’t do that, pass exams.’ So what happens to him? Haven’t you been through all this? What happens to him?

PNS: He feels at home.

K: Which means what?

PNS: He is free to express.

K: No, sir. He hasn’t felt at home. If he feels at home, what does that mean?

PNS: He trusts you.

K: No.

PNS: He is free to make mistakes.

K: No. He has security, therefore he can do—you understand what I mean? He comes to a place where there is no fear, where you don’t scold, and all the rest of it. What takes place in the student? He said ‘at home’; what does that mean? Are you at home? Are you at home in Rishi Valley?

PNS: I feel very much at home.

K: What does that mean?

PNS: I can do what I think.

K: Yes, go on. What does that mean—to be at home? Are you at home?

RS: Sir, one is not oneself at home.

K: I am not myself at home. I don’t know myself. You see, you are looking at it as a grown-up man. I am looking at the poor chap who comes to your school with all his fears of home. He may grumble, he may cry, he may be beaten, but there is always the mother. Don’t you know all this? You must know all this. There is always the mother; which means what? He can go and cry to her: ‘Daddy has beaten me, kick him for me, will you?’ [*Laughs*] You know what I am talking about. So when you are at home, you are completely secure. You feel safe, you

feel protected, you feel happy. You feel ‘My God, at last here is a group of people with whom I can be friends, and I can hold their hand.’ No?

RD: I have never known what it means to be absolutely at home even with a group of people who are very caring.

K: I am talking about children, sir.

RD: No one is ever completely at home, totally.

K: Why not?

RD: Because the child is not so. Because the people with whom he is working are not totally at home.

K: Therefore it is your responsibility to make the other teachers at home.

RD: I know only degrees of being at home.

K: Don’t quibble over all this. Be at home, sir. Make Rishi Valley, the place where you are, your home.

RD: If I say it is my home...

K: No! Make it your home.

RD: What are the depths and implications of it?

K: Not depth. You see, you are so complicated, old boy. Make it your home as R is going to make it her home and as her husband is going to make it his home; they are not going to move out of it. Just listen. I go all over the world. Wherever I go, I am a guest. Being a guest there, that’s my home.

PNS: You have a reputation, and people care so much for you that they make you feel at home.

K: I am a guest. No, you haven’t got it.

RH: It means that you have no inhibitions.

K: No, not only inhibitions. I go to Brockwood. I go to Bombay, and J and her sister and her favourite servant would be there; they look after me, they take me out for a drive and a walk, and I have all the meetings. But I am a guest there. You understand the difference between being a guest and being at home?

PNS: Yes, you are an outsider.

K: No. I am a guest—a guest of the world. Oh, for God's sake!

RH: That means you can't throw your weight around.

K: Yes, I am an outsider always living within.

RD: Aren't you always at home?

K: Don't bother. I am a solitary human being, so don't bother. I am telling you: make it your home and so feel secure there. Will you do it?

RD: I feel secure.

K: Then it is your home.

RD: It is.

K: Therefore there are no 'degrees' of home.

RD: There aren't.

K: It is your home, where you are not bullied, where Mrs T doesn't tell you what to do. But you are a guest too. You get it?

RD: Yes.

K: You are a guest of T. She hasn't to tell you, 'Do this, don't do that.' So you are at home as well as a guest. If you are not at home, *make* it your home because you are going to spend your life there. As long as you are there, *make* it your home. I may be there for a year, but I am jolly well going to see that it is my home. That means my room is decorated as I want it, if my host will permit it. Home doesn't mean 'my place'; it is a relationship. And my relationship is: it is my home, but I am a guest there.

PNS: Besides this, we have to make the new people also feel at home.

K: If you feel at home, you make everybody feel at home. And also you are a guest. That means you don't put your roots in there. I wonder if you see this? If you make it your home, see what a difference it makes. And be a guest also.

RD: If you are not a guest, you can't make it a home; then you stay away from it.

K: All right. A student comes here frightened. I don't want him to be frightened, so what shall I do? I am going to watch over him like a brooding hen. Have you ever watched a hen with her chicks, how she clucks? So I as a teacher will have to watch him. And I don't want him to be frightened. I am never going to scold

him. I am going to watch. First week I am going to watch—how he eats, how he talks, how he dresses, his ways of behaviour. I watch him, and I let him know gradually that I am watching. No fear, just watching. Then next class, can I not give marks? Remove altogether First Form, Third Form, so that the boy grows naturally, happily. Can you do that? But I am watching so that he is studying properly. I may talk it over with the principal or others when your staff meet: 'Look, that boy is not doing well, watch over, please' so that there is a report being made all the time. I also watch him in class. I am careful, I don't threaten—you know all the rest of it. Right?

RH: You are demanding excellence.

K: I am doing that. I want him to behave at his top, at his highest, because I am also demanding it with myself, and so I am demanding it from him. I am doing it very quietly, without words. Can you do all this?

RD: When you say 'no Forms', I don't understand.

K: You come to know that my life is not Form—Third Form, Sixth Form, Tenth Form. Will you do this, sir? Just try for a week, ten days, a couple of months, see how it works out. Do it; if it doesn't work out, drop it. But it will work out if there is a spirit behind it. Do you know what happens to a boy like that? Have you considered what would happen to him? That is one of the interesting points in this. You must have noticed of course that after a certain age—12, 13 or 14—he suddenly changes, becomes unmanageable, vulgar, hard, cynical; his face changes. Haven't you noticed all this? Why?

Q2: You mean the biological reasons?

K: Maybe. He is growing, his sexual organs and all the glands are functioning, but I don't think that is the major cause of this change.

RD: I think there are two other causes: one is the pressure from home as he grows older.

K: Yes sir, yes sir.

RD: And perhaps the major factor is a reaction to all those hurts he received as a child. He has now become older, he has become stronger, and now he is taking it out on others.

K: Give me some more reasons.

RD: Would you say that when he is young he is frightened?

K: You have the boy for nine months of the year.

RD: Even we are frightened.

K: We have said ‘no fear’, right? Is fear one of the causes? Fear of the monstrous world that he is going to face? Or is it that he has never known real love from somebody? Sir, if I love my son, in the right sense of that word, would that not help him to wipe away the rest? Have you such love for these children—love?

PNS: Yes.

K: Careful. Don’t say yes. Experiment—you understand? Don’t say it is biological, it is inevitable.

PNS: I don’t take in all that.

K: Take that in too. Now, if I love that boy, really have tremendous feeling, which means he can be with me without any sense of fear, would that alter altogether his psyche? You see, he is getting hardened at home.

PNS: Surely, sir.

K: Watch it, go into it. He is getting hardened at home, building a shield around himself. He comes to school, and there his shield gets thicker and thicker and thicker, and he is encased. So can he be protected here?—if I can use the word *protected* in the sense of not like a mother who wants to protect the child, but the feeling that he is being protected, that he is safe here. He feels completely safe here in the sense of being protected. Not guided—protected. Then that has an extraordinary effect on the boy. Would you do it? Don’t ask: ‘What is love? Is it this degree or that degree? Where is it, in my heart or in my toe?’ [*Laughter*]

RD: Krishnaji, you have asked this question of me for the last five years.

K: What?

RD: ‘Will you do this? Will you protect the child in this sense?’ I’ve listened, I’ve said yes, and I have noticed that when the forces of the school and of your own colleagues are acting, and when you are not strong...

K: That’s it, that’s it, old boy. Stop. You’ve said it. If you are not at home...

RD: ...totally.

K: ...totally, and if you don’t feel protected, safe—you, not the boy...

RD: Exactly, not the boy.

K: And you don't. You are battling with the principal, you are battling with somebody else, you are doing something else. But if all of you said, 'Look here, we've got to have one mind, one heart in this.' Do it, sir, for God's sake.

RD: Even that is not adequate.

K: Sir, don't split hairs.

RD: I'm not splitting hairs.

K: Have you got this feeling?

RD: Today in Rishi Valley we have this feeling.

K: That is, you are *completely* at home?

RD: No. That is why I want to...

K: No, no, don't argue. *Feel* at home.

RD: Sir, how do you feel at home just like that? Without my knowing, fear comes into being. If fear comes into being, I cannot be at home.

K: Oh, for God's sake, you are splitting hairs. Look, you don't want to have fear, nor does the student. So the first thing is to make yourself and the student feel at home. That's first. Which means he's welcome there.

RD: Now, how do I make myself feel at home?

K: No. Welcome.

RD: I understand. I'll make the child feel welcome.

K: But you are also at home, and you are a guest. As a guest you are welcome.

RD: But that's not how...

K: You see, you're not listening, you've already moved. I'll repeat it. Forgive me for the emphasis; I'm not irritated, angry. You make it your home, completely your home, right? Do it. Then 'at home' means you are also in that place a guest; therefore you are adjusting yourself, not saying, 'This must be done.' You are adjusting yourself to the place, to the people. You're a guest, but you're at home there. Do you see what I'm saying? Do you?

RD: You can't be a guest if the host is not interested in making it a home.

K: Nobody is going to make it a home for you; you are going to make it.

RD: If the host is not interested in making it a home for the child...

K: I'm asking you. I'm asking, is Rishi Valley a home for you? Don't hesitate. Home!

RD: I feel it is.

K: Therefore it's a home, right? It's your home, therefore you're there. But also...

RD: ...you're a guest.

K: Get the feeling of it, sir.

RD: Sir, what are you saying?

K: Get the feeling of being a guest while at the same time you feel at home.

SP: I too want to know the feeling of this. Are you implying that there is no sense of feeling totally at home and having at the same time a sense of permanence? A guest is never a permanent entity. You're saying something which doesn't exist.

K: I go to Brockwood; I feel at home there, but I'm a guest. What is a guest?

SP: He comes for a while.

K: No.

SP: Yes, there's no permanence to anything.

K: You've missed the whole thing.

AC: I have felt a guest in Vasanta Vihar. To me it has meant being highly sensitive to the whole place, and I have also felt at home.

K: That's all. I'm at home here, but I've also been very watchful. I'm adjusting myself to people, watching. But as it is my home, I'm also going to say, 'Look, I'm going to criticize, I'm going to watch, I'm going to change, I'm going to move.' This is simple, what's the difficulty in this?

SP: He is saying that in a place like Rishi Valley where there are so many people, a single person alone can't create a home. It's a constant movement of relationships.

K: No, don’t complicate all this. Just listen. I asked R if it is his home. He’s so hesitant.

SP: I can quite see that.

K: Of course. Therefore it is not his home. I said, ‘Make it your home.’

SP: How does one make it a home?

RD: The word *home,* the way you define it...

K: You know what *home* means?

RD: No, sir. You’re giving to the word *home* a tremendous meaning.

K: Of course.

RD: If another person asks me this question, I won’t bat an eyelid. I will tell him straightaway it’s my home, but when you ask the question...

K: What does that mean? Where you are protected, where you’re safe; you lock the windows, doors, you sleep well. You have put away your things, your books, your gramophone, whatever you have. It’s your home, shelter, where you’re taking shelter, right? Home means a shelter, protected, safe. You feel you can sit on a chair and stretch out your legs and listen to any gramophone record. A sanctuary.

RD: Is this feeling irrespective of...

K: ...everything else. They [*referring to the noise of loud music in the neighbourhood*] began this morning at 4.30, but it is still my home.

RD: Yes, but they are outside your boundaries.

K: No! You make your home.

PNS: It’s something in you that makes you feel at home anywhere you go.

K: No. What’s the matter with all of you? I’m talking about Rishi Valley: make it your home.

Q3: Does one need protection to make something a home?

K: Don’t you need protection?

Q3: Isn’t that asking for security? Aren’t you asking for security?

K: No. Four walls of that room. Why are you all making it so complicated? Look, I sleep in there; I don't want to be woken up suddenly, I don't like it because it upsets me. I want to wake up slowly, quietly, so I bolt the door. I feel safe, you follow? The four walls and the room and the floor—it's my home where I can do what I like.

Q2: You can do what you like, yet not in excess. It's a home where you don't take things easy.

K: Why not? What's the matter with all of you? I stretch my legs out, I take it all easy. Am I a strange animal?

Q2: There is the Foundation which may ask him to get out.

K: I'm not talking about the Foundation. It may be my home, but I don't trespass, I don't do something which is contrary to a home. Therefore I'm a guest as well as being at home. We've got it so clear; what are you all fighting about? Will you make it your home? Don't beat about the bush, make it your home. See what happens to you. You really feel at home there. Make it, not say, 'Well, I may be turned out.' As long as I'm there it's my home. A guest means a person who is responsible for his acts outside the home because he has to live in a community, he has to live with his host, which is the community. But I'm not going to accept it if the community says, 'We all smoke here, we all eat meat here.' I don't, so I convince them, or I get out because I'm a guest.

RD: This business of being a guest and being at home.

K: Yes, sir! See the beauty of it. That is, you're both the teacher and the disciple.

RD: That's the same thing, right?

K: Yes, sir! At last you're getting something. Will you all do this?

PNS: I'm doing it.

K: Good. So that you're perfectly safe there, and you make the students perfectly safe. See what happens: no fear, no threat. He's protected, he's watched over—his food, his clothes, his laundry, his walk; there is somebody who is caring for him. At home the mother cares, but she has got too much to do. Here a whole group of people are looking after me. You know what it does, all of you looking after me? Do you know what it does to me?

PNS: Yes. I feel very secure.

K: No, sir. I worship you. Oh, you people don't know anything about it. I respect you, I love you, I won't do anything to upset you. Because you're watching me, protecting me. I won't talk anymore; you've got it.

* * *

Now: yesterday evening R and I were walking, and the sea was very calm, reaching from horizon to horizon. And R said to me that Vedanta means 'the end of knowledge'.

RB: It is one meaning.

K: Good enough. Why do you give more? Are there several other meanings?

RB: Yes. [*Laughter*] I don't give it, but it has acquired other meanings.

K: No. The root meaning of the word.

RB: The root meaning is 'the end of knowledge'.

K: That's what I want to stick to. Not what the commentators have made out of that or what the local gurus have said. The real root meaning is 'the end of knowledge'. Now, we first posit duality, we first state that there is duality. (Not between man and woman or in nature.) Then we say we must achieve non-duality. First we posit it, then say we must be free of it.

RB: It isn't quite what I said.

K: Now you say what you want to say.

RB: You said yesterday that there is no evolution. And it seems that nobody has ever said this. But I pointed out that people have said this; Vedanta has.

K: I asked, has anybody said this? I didn't say that nobody has said it.

RB: Yes, all right. They have always said that there is no evolution.

K: Who?

RB: The Vedantins. According to them, there is no evolution.

K: You see, I object. May I?

RB: Yes, please.

K: The moment you identify yourself as a Vedantin, you've already created a duality.

RB: Sure, yes.

K: Got it? Now proceed. If I identify myself as a Buddhist, I'm separate.

RB: All right. Let us leave the Vedantins alone. They have said that there is no evolution. We were saying that this has tremendous implication. If there is no evolution, it brings in many other questions. We were also talking about the question of reward and punishment, which implies that there is no outside agency.

K: That's right.

RB: It appears to me that if you say there is no evolution, it implies the same thing. It may not be so obvious, but when you say there is no evolution, it implies that there is no outside agency.

K: Why do you say it implies? Are you interested in all this?

RH: May I say something? It also implies that there is no inside agency.

K: No. Just a minute. First let's see what she says—that it implies no outside agency. Why do you say that?

RB: In fact, it implies that there is no outside or inside.

K: Why do you bring in 'outside, inside'?

RB: Because it was mentioned yesterday that when you say there is no reward and punishment, it implies that there is no outside agency.

K: You're repeating, but I don't quite capture why you're introducing 'outside agency'. Look, there is cause-effect. Where there is a cause, there is an effect, which becomes the cause, and you get the chain of cause-effect, which can go on indefinitely. That's also becoming, that's also evolution. And when K says that there's no evolution, the whole momentum of 'has been', 'will be', 'must be', all that momentum is stopped; otherwise...

RB: ...you're back in the time-process.

K: No. Evolution.

RB: Evolution means...

K: ...time-process. And reward and punishment—I've lived on that all my life; my mind, my brain, is trained for that. It is educated to act in one way if there is reward and to act differently if there is punishment. Can I understand that there is

no reward and punishment, that it's just another invention of thought, inwardly? In the psychological world there is no reward and punishment. We have lived that way, but actually there is none. That's an illusion.

RB: Yes. It also brings in the question of who receives the reward and who is punished.

K: The image I have...

RB: Yes. It's only the image, which is a fiction.

K: Yes. Which is the image that thought has built as the 'me', and when there is reward I act in one way, and when there's punishment I act differently.

RB: Because there is the image...

K: That's it.

RB: ...there is the idea that there is something outside the image which gives the punishment.

K: Yes.

RB: Or the reward.

K: Yes. Or I can create my own rewards and punishments.

RB: Yes. That is, the same thought invents karma, the system of karma, or whatever it is. That means I create a system by which I'm rewarded or punished.

K: Yes, yes. So reward and punishment. There is duality, right?

RB: Yes, of course. I don't know why you're against the outside agency.

K: I'm not. I'm saying the outside agency is environment.

RB: Environment or an imaginary existence.

K: Of course.

RB: Which is other than the image.

K: Environment, society, my father, my mother—the outside agency is that. And that outside agency has helped me to build an image about myself, and I have created the image myself. And that image acts as a reward and all the rest of it.

Now, the image itself is an illusion. When I realize that it's an illusion, there is no reward and punishment.

RB: Yes.

K: So there is no conflict. Whereas if I assert and posit that there is duality and then try to get beyond it...

RB: Because the mind that posits duality is in duality, it cannot get beyond duality.

K: Therefore whatever it says is not.

RB: Yes. But there is perception: you explain something, I see it. Till you explained it or till I partook of the process of inquiry, I didn't see it. So there was the non-seeing and then the seeing.

K: No. There was first non-seeing...

RB: Yes.

K: Careful. What did you say?

RB: When the seeing exists, there is no non-seeing.

K: That's all.

RB: When there is non-seeing, there is no seeing.

K: Yes. Therefore there's no duality.

RB: And no evolution.

K: Of course.

RB: But there is some...

K: ...action which is not of time. Non-seeing, will it become seeing?

RB: No.

K: That's it. If that is becoming, non-seeing gradually becoming seeing, then you have duality. Where there is that duality, you have conflict.

RB: Yes, of course.

K: We started out with: can we live without conflict? If I put that question seriously to myself, the problem of reward and punishment has no place.

RB: There's tremendous depth to it, there is so much in that.

K: Of course. K is saying there is no duality. He doesn't posit.

RB: Yes, he just says there's no duality.

K: Which means...

RB: ...it's not a fact. The opposites are not a fact.

K: Yes.

RB: While the Bhagavad Gita, for example, posits duality and says you must be free from duality.

K: Yes.

SP: Would you say it posits or describes the reality of man?

RB: Yes, you may say that.

SP: It starts with the description of the illusion of duality.

RB: Yes, it posits the reality of duality.

K: What is the Buddhist position?

RB: I was discussing this with Krishnaji—the image is unreal.

K: Absolutely.

RB: Unreal, meaning it has no existence.

K: Yes. It has no existence; it is merely a verbal structure put together by thought.

RB: The non-existent 'me' sees something.

K: You can't.

RB: No, it does. It says, 'I see a flower', 'I see a bad man, I see a good man.'

K: But when that non-existent ‘me’, that illusion, looks at something, looks at fear, it is looking at it as though it were something separate from itself.

RB: Not only that; that non-existent ‘me’ is fear. Fear is a part of it, and it looks at human beings, at the world, at objects, everything from that base.

K: Of course.

RB: So what it sees is a part of that non-existence.

K: Be careful, be careful. It needs consideration.

RB: I’m thinking of what R said yesterday about appearance and reality. It’s a much-discussed question, you can’t dismiss it.

K: I don’t; I don’t dismiss it.

RB: Logically, when the ‘me’ sees, what the image sees is always appearance.

K: I see what you’re saying.

AP: May I state what the Buddhists say?

K: Yes, that’s what I asked.

AP: The Buddhists say that there is no self.

K: No self.

AP: Yes.

K: Of course.

AP: Now, the logical corollary to this—and the Buddhist position—is that the self is a process which begins in the brain and ends there; therefore there is no reality to it. They have stated this very clearly in *Mahayan*. It is also implicit in the other.

RB: If one were to simplify it, what he said was that the seeing through the ‘me’ is appearance. Seeing where there is no ‘me’ is real, truth. If there is the ‘me’ seeing, then it is a world of illusion, or cause and effect of the cycle of incarnations.

RH: That’s not the way I understand it, because the self is not brought into this conflict of the *samsara*. The way I understand it is that *nirvana* is not something apart from or outside the becoming. Perception of *samsara* is *nirvana*.

K: Seeing the nature of the senses.

RH: Of the becoming, of *samsara*.

K: Seeing the nature of the senses. When thought takes over the senses, then begins the becoming. And that becoming is *nirvana*?

RB: Becoming can never lead to *nirvana*.

K: That's what I want to be clear about.

RH: Becoming cannot lead to *nirvana*, but seeing the becoming in its true nature, seeing it as it is, can.

K: I see becoming as an endless process. Which means evolution, which means time. And that becoming has cause-effect. The same thing, to put it differently. It ends; what is then is truth, if you call that truth *nirvana*. I don't care what words you use. Then what? That's all that the Buddha says?

EWA: He also says that there is the *ajatha*, that which is not born, not made up: *asangatha*.

K: Are you saying this—there is that which is not put together by thought?

EWA: Yes. And one of the first things the Buddha said after enlightenment—so the books say—was that his thought ceased to be.

K: Yes. I understand, I understand that.

EWA: *Visankaragatham chittam*. *Chitta* is thought. *Sankara* is to 'put together'. *Visankaragatham* means 'dissolved'.

K: Right?

RB: What is becoming, sir? Becoming is only the image becoming something. The image is illusion, so the whole of becoming is illusion.

K: Of course.

RB: So when that illusion ends, is not, that may be...

K: Don't say 'end'.

RB: What do you say then?

K: Is not.

RB: ‘Is not’. When the illusion is not, there is *nirvana*.

K: That’s what you’re saying.

RH: There is something else also: *nirvana* is not to be found externally, away from you.

RB: It cannot be, because the illusion is not external. So when the illusion is not, the whole thing is internal.

K: Right, sir? Do you agree to this?

AP: I was trying to make a very interesting point: when the Buddha said something, in the process of communication, the stages came into existence. That is how the mind projects, and it creates stages in that which is just there.

K: Of course those commentary fellows, they really didn’t see the truth of what the Buddha was saying.

EWA: Clearly they hadn’t.

K: They didn’t, that’s all.

AP: No. They thought that this led to that.

K: Yes sir, yes sir. That’s what you were asking, somebody was asking.

RB: You said yesterday that good cannot touch evil.

K: That’s right.

RB: I think commentators in the future will say that Krishnaji admitted duality. [*Laughter*]

K: I’ll be dead by then, so it’s all right. [*Laughter*]

RB: No, I think this requires a little explanation.

K: You see, what I meant was: if love is the opposite of hate, then it’s not love. If hate is inherent in love, then it is not love. If in love there is antagonism, it is not love. If there is hurt, wound, inside me, then the other [love] cannot exist. When there is hate, there is not the other. When there is love, the other is not.

RB: Could I put it in another way just to see if it is clear? If I have an idea of love, then I posit an opposite which is hate.

K: Of course.

RB: Neither the love which I have thought of nor the hate which I have projected are anything other than thought, other than the product of thought.

K: Is love associated with thought?

RB: No, that's what I'm trying to say.

K: Of course.

RB: The moment it is associated with thought, that thought can create the opposite.

K: Yes. And love has nothing to do with thought.

RB: Love has nothing to do with thought.

K: That's all we are saying. If love is the opposite of hate, then it's not love.

RB: Yes.

K: That's all, very simple. If good is the opposite of evil, then it is not good. But we say the two exist and therefore create duality.

RB: Every opposite is just the product of thought.

K: No, I would put it differently: good has no opposite, love has no opposite.

RB: Does evil have an opposite?

K: No, it is evil. It can invent the opposite. I kill somebody, that is evil. To harm somebody is not right.

RB: The other day a scientist asked, 'What is wrong with killing people?'

K: I know, I know. That is what Lenin is supposed to have said: human beings are a burden, it does not matter how you kill them. (Solzhenitsyn says that.) I think the thing is really very simple. Love has no opposite. If there is hate, there is no love; that's all. If I am jealous, there is no love.

RB: So there is only *what is*, the fact.

K: That's it, that's it. If there is love, the other *cannot* exist. But love is not the product of thought.

RB: Would you accept this statement: there is no evolution, there is only *what is*?

K: That's right. And if the ending of *what is* takes time, that is evolution too. Right?

RB: Yes.

K: I wonder if you see that?

RB: Yes.

HP: *What is* has a cause. What is going on in the mind has a cause.

K: Of course.

HP: So then there is evolution. If it has a cause, then there is evolution.

K: No, no.

RB: *What is* is jealousy; if the ending of that takes time, it is evolution.

K: It is very clear, simple. I am envious, and if I take time and say I will get over envy next year, in the meantime I am going to enjoy myself with envy; that is evolution. Because the ending of it takes time, right? I am envious, and one day I will be free from envy—the distance has to be covered, which is time, which is evolution. If I don't end it now, every other action is evolution. I wonder if it is clear? Is this all mysterious?

AP: Can we put it like this? Time is not a conveyor belt which automatically takes you to the end-product where you wish to go.

K: Certainly not. We said that

HP: Is there an end-product?

AP: No. When it happens, it does not happen because of the passage of time. It may not happen, I may not see it. But when it happens, it is not due to time. Time is not a ladder, not a conveyor belt. Therefore becoming becomes meaningless.

K: Sir, does the Buddha talk about time?

EWA: Yes. The *dhamma* is said to be *kalavimukta*; that means, 'which is free from time'. *Kala* is time, *vimukta* is free. That is, that which is free from time is *dhamma*, the truth.

K: The truth. I see.

Q4: When you say there is no evolution, there can also be the implication that it has no cause at all.

* * *

K: We can go on indefinitely, can we come back? We have more or less finished with this.

Can we come back to the schools? Because Rishi Valley and Rajghat have existed for sixty years, fifty years. It has taken time to come to what it is now. We call that evolution, but it hasn't evolved. Right?

AP: Yes. That's just what I was saying—that the existence of Rishi Valley and Rajghat in the present condition is itself a repudiation of the notion that through time we shall get somewhere.

K: Of course, of course.

AP: Therefore there is also the certainty that if you want to do it, you can do it instantly.

K: That's right.

AP: There is also the annihilation of time.

K: If R wants to make Rishi Valley a home, he does it *now*. You don't ask, 'How am I to make it?' Now, what I wanted to say was that these places have existed; only recently have Bangalore and Madras come into being. And the school in Bombay has taken twenty-five to thirty years, but they are all recent, comparatively recent. But the older schools have existed for fifty years at least, and basically nothing fundamental has happened. Now, in Rishi Valley and Rajghat and of course in the other schools, can we not allow time but change them, move them in a totally differently direction? Revolution is generally considered physical, right? Capitalism disappears and socialism comes into being; socialism disappears and communism comes in. Now, all this has taken time.

Do we together see that a home is necessary for each one of us? Each one of us must make a home for himself in Rishi Valley and Rajghat. 'Home' means a safe shelter for himself where he is at ease, where he can do what he likes within the confines of that room. If he says, 'I will do what I like because this is my home, therefore I get up at ten o'clock and go to the school at eleven o'clock', then he is abusing his being a guest. So I say 'guest'. Though you are at home, you have to be punctual. Breakfast, the host says, is at eight o'clock, the host being that we have all agreed to come at eight o'clock or whatever time it is. So you are both at home and a guest. Clear?

PNS: Very clear.

K: And when the student comes, you have to make him *completely* at home. Which means he is at home. And also he is a guest, therefore he must adjust to everything that we have all agreed to. We are the hosts, though he is at home; therefore he has to be punctual, careful, all that. And it may be a biological fact that a boy of ten becomes a monster at the age of eighteen—monster, if I can use that word. It is our job to see if it can be prevented. And I feel one can prevent it, really deeply, when there is love in all this. Not Forms—that is a secondary issue, that can be changed. You may have to change it. I have no Forms, why should you? I have been to school; fortunately I failed in every one of them. [*Laughter*] Why should this boy have a Form? So we have to invent something which is not Form, right? Let us invent something which is original, not just copy the rest of the world; it is more exciting, sir.

PNS: Sir, he had an excellent idea of introducing a very good system whereby we can bring out the real originality in the child. We must consider that.

K: Originality—what does that mean?

PNS: If I have what the child is interested in...

K: No, no, leave the child. You see, you are all looking at the child. What do you originate—the origin? Look, you have worked at Third Form, Eighth Form, Tenth Form. To be original, unique, means to change the whole thing, find a different way of doing exams, totally differently. Can we all do it? Sir, let's do it. Now don't look so depressed. [*Laughter*] I know I can break it. If I were in Rishi Valley, I know I can break the system of Forms. First I would get together all the teachers in Rishi Valley. If I were in Bangalore, I would do the same—get them all together and show how dangerous it is. Because you are encouraging fear in him, apprehension of what is going to happen in the future. So I would get together all the teachers and say: 'Okay, let us work this out. I want your ideas, each one's ideas; let's put them all together and discard that which is absurd, that which is personal, and all that. Let us look at it all together.' It is our baby then, you follow? It is not that you do it and I am opposed to it, or I do it and you think it should be done differently, but we are all together, cooperating to create this. Can you do it? Will you do it? Then we have started something totally new. I believe some of the schools and universities in America are trying no examinations. I don't mean that. I mean bringing about a mind that has no fear. If there is no fear there is love, there is no duality. [*Laughter*]

AP: If I may say so, if the teacher feels that this system of examination constricts the horizons of learning both for the teacher and for the student, and if the school exists to transcend those limits, then you are out of it; we have a breakthrough, and the examination ceases to be a nightmare for everybody.

K: Of course. Will you all *do* it? That's all I want to find out.

AP: That's the point.

K: We have talked about the blasted thing for years. Can we break this thing and create something original? It is a monotonous thing for me to go back.

RD: Krishnaji, unless we are all at home as a group...

K: It's your job to make them feel at home.

RD: That has been the main difficulty now.

K: It is not.

RD: It has been.

K: No. Because you haven't made it your home.

RD: Yes. But I am saying now.

K: And you insist that everybody make it his home. You demand that everybody make the place his home.

RD: I am not demanding this of the others just now. I am saying that unless I am at home, these things remain words.

K: Words. Quite right.

RD: Now the difficulty is: how do you create it?

K: How do *you*?

RD: How do I make it a home when around me are people who are pushing, jostling, because it is not a home for them?

K: So what will you do?

RD: I don't know.

K: Don't say you don't know.

PNS: Sir, it is our responsibility.

K: The moment you say, 'I don't know', you are finished. Inquire. I am at home here, and you are not at home; I have to live with you.

RD: Yes, that is the reality.

K: That is the reality. So what do I do? Isolate myself? Go to my room and lock the door?

RD: No.

K: So what shall I do? I want to know why this chap doesn't feel at home. Why? Is he waiting, using Rishi Valley to get a better job? If he is, I tell him: 'I say, look, even though you are here for six months or two years, make it your home, for God's sake. If you want to leave, leave. But before you leave, make it your home.' If you say that, then make it, but if you say, 'Well, he is leaving two years later, what the hell is it...' But if you all insist that Rishi Valley, Rajghat, every place is your home, you will see things happening differently.

Madras, 10 January 1983

List of Participants

K:	J. Krishnamurti
AC:	Ahalya Chari
AK:	A. Kumaraswamy
AM:	Alok Mathur
AP:	Achyut Patwardhan
EWA:	E. W. Adhikaram
GN:	G. Narayan
HP:	Harshad Parekh
KJ:	Kabir Jaithirtha
KPK:	Kishore P. Khairnar
KY:	Krishnan Kutty
PJ:	Pupul Jayakar
PNS:	P. N. Shreeniwas
PS:	Padma Santhanam
Q:	Questioner
RB:	Radha Burnier
RD:	Rajesh Dalal
RH:	Radhika Herzberger
RS:	R. Shanker
RT:	Rebecca Thomas
SF:	Scott Forbes
SP:	Sunanda Patwardhan

Download more eBooks here: http://avaxhome.ws/blogs/ChrisRedfield

Don't Make a Problem of Anything

DISCUSSIONS WITH J KRISHNAMURTI

In these discussions, Krishnamurti goes deeply into the question of human problems, drawing, in the process, a most interesting distinction between the 'professional' and the 'human being'. He asks whether we do not regard ourselves as professionals first and as human beings afterwards. Our education generally makes us professionals in the sense that right from childhood we are trained to solve physical problems. The brain thus gets conditioned to solving problems, and it carries over the same mentality to the psychological realm and so comes to look upon any situation, any emotion as a terrible problem to be solved. The very nature of the problem-solving mind is its inability to see itself as the problem-creating mind, and so it never comes to the end of problems. In different contexts, through various examples, Krishnamurti returns again and again to his great insight: *Don't make a problem of anything in life.*

Though Krishnamurti is addressing mostly teachers of the schools he founded, there is something here for everyone: for those interested in a new kind of education, for parents, for the pundits in Vedanta or Buddhism, for psychologists, for those in the ordinary workaday world, for religious seekers…

ISBN 81-87326-65-4

9 788187 326540

Philosophy / Education

Price Rs.150/-